

HERSTEIN'S QUESTION ABOUT SIMPLE RINGS WITH INVOLUTION

VERED MOSKOWICZ

ABSTRACT. The aim of this paper is to try to answer Herstein's question concerning simple rings with involution, namely: If R is a simple ring with an involution of the first kind, with $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ and $\text{Char}(Z(R)) \neq 2$, is it true that $S^2 = R$? We shall see that in such a ring R , $R = S^3$. We shall bring two possible criteria, each shows when $R = S^2$. The first criterion: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$. The second criterion: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xKy \subseteq S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$. Actually, those results are true without any restriction on the dimension of R over $Z(R)$. In the special case of matrices (with the transpose involution and with the symplectic involution) over a field of characteristic not equal to 2, it is not difficult to find, for example, $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Therefore, proving Herstein's remark that for matrices the answer is known to be positive. Similar results for K^6 , K^4 , $K + KSK$, $KS + K^2$, SKS and S^2K can also be found.

1. INTRODUCTION

Herstein has asked in his book [2] the following question: Let R be a simple ring with an involution of the first kind (namely, the center of R , $Z(R)$, is contained in the set of symmetric elements of R , S), with $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ and $Z(R)$ is of characteristic not equal to 2. Is it true that $S^2 = R$, where S^2 denotes the additive subgroup of R generated by all ab with $a, b \in S$? Herstein has remarked there, without a proof, that for matrices the answer is known to be positive. Of course, if $R = S$ then $R = S^2$ (since $S \subseteq S^2$), so to avoid this trivial positive answer we will assume that $S \subsetneq R$. Notice that if S is a commutative set, then $S^2 = S$. Therefore, if $S \subsetneq R$, then $S^2 = S \subsetneq R$, a trivial negative answer. As a first step towards an answer, we shall see that in such a ring R (with S not a commutative set) $R = S^3$, see Corollary 2.4. As a second step, we shall see:

- A first possible criterion for $R = S^2$: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$, see Theorem 2.20.
- A second possible criterion for $R = S^2$: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$, see Theorem 2.26.

Actually, those results are true without any restriction on the dimension of R over $Z(R)$. In the special case of matrices $M_n(F)$ where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2: We shall suggest specific $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$ for the transpose involution ($n \geq 2$) and for the symplectic involution ($2m = n \geq 4$), see Example 2.19. Therefore, proving Herstein remark that for matrices the answer is positive. So if one wishes to construct a negative answer to Herstein's question, one should construct a simple ring R with an involution of the

first kind with $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ and $Z(R)$ is of characteristic not equal to 2 (and with $S \subsetneq R$), such that:

- S is a commutative set: Indeed, if S is commutative, then Proposition 1.1 shows that $S^2 \subsetneq R$. In fact, in this case Corollary 2.11 shows that $Z(R) = S$.
or
- S is not a commutative set and there exists an element $w \in S^3$ which is not in S^2 (since Corollary 2.4 says that $S^3 = R$. Even without Corollary 2.4, it is obvious that if there exists an element $w \in S^3$ which is not in S^2 , then $S^2 \subsetneq S^3 \subseteq R$, so $S^2 \subsetneq R$).

Finally, similar results for other subsets, namely: K^6 , K^4 , $K + KSK$, $KS + K^2$, SKS and S^2K can be found in Theorem 3.2, Theorem 3.6, Theorem 3.7, Corollary 3.15 and Corollary 3.26.

Some usual notations which will be used: Let R be any associative ring with 1 (or any associative F -algebra with 1, where F is a field). $Z(R)$ will denote the center of R . If A, B are any subsets of R , then A is a commutative set if for every $x, y \in A$, $xy = yx$. A is a skew-commutative set if for every $x, y \in A$, $xy = -yx$. The centralizer of A , $Cent(A)$ is the set (one sees that it is actually a subring of R) of elements of R which commute element-wise with the elements of A , $Cent(A) = \{r \in R \mid \forall a \in A, ra = ar\}$. AB is the additive subgroup of R generated by all products of the form ab where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. (AB is the F -subspace of R generated by all products of the form ab where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$). $A \circ B$ is the additive subgroup of R generated by all products of the form $ab + ba$ where $a \in A$ and $B \in B$ ($\circ$ denotes the Jordan product $a \circ b = ab + ba$). $\bar{A}$ is the subring (F -subalgebra) of R generated by A . If R has an involution $*$, then S will denote the set of symmetric elements of R and K will denote the set of skew-symmetric elements of R . T will denote the traces $T = \{r + r^* \mid r \in R\} \subseteq S$ and T_0 will denote the skew-traces $T_0 = \{r - r^* \mid r \in R\} \subseteq K$. In the matrix ring $M_n(F)$, e_{ij} will denote the $n \times n$ matrix having 1 in the ij component and 0 otherwise.

We shall work in a context where R will denote an associative F -algebra with 1 and with an involution $*$ such that:

- F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2. This implies that $R = S + K$, since $\forall r \in R, r = 2^{-1}(r + r^*) + 2^{-1}(r - r^*)$.
- The involution $*$ is of the first kind, namely, $Z(R) \subseteq S$. This implies that $S \subseteq S^2 \subseteq S^3$ etc, since $1 \in Z(R) \subseteq S$.
- $S \subsetneq R$. This assumption is made in order to dispose of the trivial case $S = R$, which implies $S^2 \supseteq S = R$, so Herstein's question has a positive (trivial) answer.

Notice that we have not made any assumptions on $\dim_{Z(R)} R$ yet. Actually, we will not need this assumption. We shall say something about $\dim_{Z(R)} R$ later on.

Next, we dispose of the following trivial case:

Proposition 1.1. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. If S is a commutative set, then $S^2 \neq R$.*

Proof. By definition, $S^2 = \{\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i b_i \mid a_i, b_i \in S\}$.

Take $w \in S^2$. So, $w = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} a_i b_i$ where $a_i, b_i \in S$. Then we have $w^* = (\sum a_i b_i)^* = \sum (a_i b_i)^* = \sum (b_i)^* (a_i)^* = \sum b_i a_i = \sum a_i b_i = w$, so $w \in S$, hence $S^2 \subseteq S$. But obviously, since $1 \in Z(R) \subseteq S$, $S \subseteq S^2$. Therefore, $S^2 = S$. Finally, using our assumption that S is strictly contained in R , we get $S^2 \subsetneq R$. $\square$

2. RESULTS ABOUT S^3, S^2

In view of Proposition 1.1, if one wishes to find a positive answer to Herstein's question, one should assume that S is not a commutative set. Hence, from now on we will usually deal with S which is not a commutative set.

2.1. Results about S^3 . We give now two easy lemmas; both lemmas will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.3. Actually, in the proof of Theorem 2.3 we will only use those two lemmas and not more. Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 do not say anything interesting if S is a commutative set. Similarly, when we consider S^2 , Lemma 2.13 and Lemma 2.14 do not say anything interesting if S is a commutative set. They are brought separately, each on its own right, and not just inside the proof of Theorem 2.3, because:

- The first lemma (or more accurately, a special case of it) will be used directly in another result, namely (ii) of Proposition 2.7.
- The second lemma relies heavily on an idea of Herstein, more specifically, on the first part of the proof of Lemma 1.3 in [1]. We just change in Herstein's argument from $-$ to $+$, and add a $*$. This will be clear in the proof of the second lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$. Then for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^3$. In other words, the right ideal $(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^3 .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r \in R$ $(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^3$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$: For every $r \in R$, $rx y + xy r^* = rx y + yx r^* - yx r^* + xy r^*$ (we just added and subtracted $yx r^*$). Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rx y + xy r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rx y + yx r^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta + (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim: $\alpha \in S^3$, $\beta \in S$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in S$, since $(\beta)^* = (rx y + yx r^*)^* = yx r^* + rx y = \beta$. As for α : Of course, given $r \in R$, r can be written as $r = s + k$ where $s \in S$ and $k \in K$. $\alpha = rx y + xy r^* = (s + k)xy + xy(s - k) = (sxy + xys) + (kxy - xyk) = (sxy + xys) + [(kx - xk)y - x(yk - ky)]$. $sxy + xys \in S^3$ merely by definition of S^3 ($x, y, s \in S$). $(kx - xk)y - x(yk - ky) \in S^2$ since $kx - xk, y, x, yk - ky \in S$.

Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = \alpha - \beta \in S^3$ (remember that $S \subseteq S^2 \subseteq S^3$). But $R = R^*$ (since $r = (r^*)^*$), so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^3$. (We could, of course, from the first place take $r^*xy + xy r = r^*xy + yx r - yx r + xy r$ instead of $rx y + xy r^* = rx y + yx r^* - yx r^* + xy r^*$, and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in S^3$). Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^3$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 2.1 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, therefore S^3 contains a non-zero right ideal of R , namely $(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ (clearly, $0 \neq (xy - yx)1 \in (xy - yx)R$).

Lemma 2.2. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$. Then for every $r, u \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in S^3$. In other words, the two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^3 .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r, u \in R$ $u(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^3$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$:

Claim: for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^3$, $wu + u^*w \in S^3$. It is enough to show that for every $a, b, c \in S$, $abcu + u^*abc \in S^3$ (indeed, if for every $a_i, b_i, c_i \in S$, $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in S^3$, then taking $S^3 \ni w = \sum a_i b_i c_i$, we get $wu + u^*w = (\sum a_i b_i c_i)u + u^*(\sum a_i b_i c_i) = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i)$, so since each $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in S^3$, we get $wu + u^*w = \dots = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i) \in S^3$). Now, $abcu + u^*abc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - abu^*c - aubc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c$. Clearly, $cu + u^*c, u^*a + au, bu^* + ub \in S$, concluding that $abcu + u^*abc = \dots = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c \in S^3$. So we have proved the claim that for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^3$, $wu + u^*w \in S^3$.

Next, the above lemma, Lemma 2.1, says that for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^3$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u + u^*((xy - yx)r) \in S^3$. Use again the above lemma to get that $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in S^3$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u^*((xy - yx)r) \in S^3$. Obviously, since $R = R^*$ we get that for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in S^3$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^3$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 2.2 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, therefore S^3 contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R , namely $R(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ (clearly, $0 \neq 1(xy - yx)1 \in R(xy - yx)R$). We proceed to our theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then there exists a non-zero two-sided ideal of R which is contained in S^3 .*

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 2.2, as was explained immediately after it. $\square$

Theorem 2.3 immediately implies the following:

Corollary 2.4 (First step towards an answer to Herstein's question). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then $S^3 = R$.*

Proof. Follows at once from Theorem 2.3. $\square$

Remark 2.5. Let R be as in Corollary 2.4.

- If $\dim_F(R) = n\infty$, then $n > \dim_F(S) \geq n^{1/3}$:
Indeed, $\dim_F(R) = \dim_F(S^3) \leq (\dim_F(S))^3$ (the first equality is true since $R = S^3$). Therefore, $n \leq (\dim_F(S))^3$, so $\dim_F(S) \geq n^{1/3}$.
- If $\dim_F(R) = \infty$, then $\dim_F(S) = \infty$:
Otherwise, $\dim_F(S) = m < \infty$. But then $\infty = \dim_F(R) = \dim_F(S^3) \leq (\dim_F(S))^3 = m^3$, a contradiction.

Example 2.6 (Major example: Matrices over a field). Let $R = M_n(F)$, where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2 and $n > 1$ (of course, if $n = 1$ then $R = S$ and we have already disposed of that case at the beginning). It is well known that R is simple and that there exist two involutions on R : the transpose involution and the symplectic involution (remember that the symplectic involution only exists for $n = 2m$). See Rowen's book for a discussion about the two involutions on $M_n(F)$ [3, page 43]. Corollary 2.4 shows that:

- The transpose involution: For $n \geq 2$, $S^3 = R$ (it is easily seen that S is not a commutative set).
- The symplectic involution: For $n = 2m \geq 4$, $S^3 = R$ (it is easily seen that S is not a commutative set). Notice that when $n = 2$ one cannot use Corollary 2.4, since in that corollary S is assumed to be a noncommutative set, but in $M_2(F)$, $S \cong F$, so S is a commutative set (moreover, S is a field, not just a set). Clearly, in $M_2(F)$, $S^3 = S^2 = S \cong F \subsetneq M_2(F)$.

2.1.1. $S^3 = R$ without simplicity. If one prefers to dismiss of the condition that R is simple, but still have $S^3 = R$, then we offer the following proposition. It demands a stronger condition than noncommutativity of S (for example, in (ii) we demand that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible).

Proposition 2.7. Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then,

- If there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and such that 1 can be written as $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} u_i(xy - yx)v_i$ where $u_i, v_i \in R$, then $S^3 = R$.
- If a stronger condition than the condition in (i) is satisfied, namely, if there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, then (in addition to $S^3 = R$) each element of R can be written in the form $\lambda + \mu + \nu$, where $\lambda \in S$, $\mu = a_1b_1 + a_2b_2$, $\nu = \tilde{a}_1\tilde{b}_1\tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{a}_2\tilde{b}_2\tilde{c}_2$, with $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{b}_2, \tilde{c}_2 \in S$.

Remarks 2.8. • Notice that we could drop the condition "Assume S is not a commutative set", since afterwards in (i) and in (ii) we already demand that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$.

- Of course (ii) is stronger than (i): Let $z \in R$ such that $(xy - yx)z = 1$. Then (i) is indeed satisfied by taking, for example, $u_1 = 1, v_1 = z$.
- (ii) of this proposition says that there is an upper bound on the number of monomials of length 3 in the representation of every element $r \in R$, namely: 5 monomials at most are needed. (We consider $a \in S$ as having length 3, for example $a = a11$. Similarly ab is of length 3, $ab = ab1$ where $a, b \in S$).
- For the proof of (ii) only the first lemma, Lemma 2.1 is needed. However, for the proof (i) the second lemma, Lemma 2.2 is needed.

Proof. (i) Write $1 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} u_i(xy - yx)v_i$ where $u_i, v_i \in R$ and $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. This of course implies that the non-zero two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ equals R . But from Lemma 2.2, $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^3 . Therefore, $S^3 = R$.

(ii) By assumption there exists $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, so there exists $z \in R$ such that $(xy - yx)z = 1$. For every $r \in R$, $rx y + x y r^* = r x y + y x r^* - y x r^* + x y r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = r x y + y x r^*$. So for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = \alpha(r) - \beta(r)$. We have seen in the proof of Lemma 2.1 that $\beta(r) \in S$ and $\alpha(r) \in S^3$. More elaborately for $\alpha(r)$, we have seen that if $r = s + k$ with $s \in S$ and $k \in K$: $\alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^* = \dots = (s x y + x y s) + [(k x - x k)y - x(y k - k y)]$.

So denote: $\lambda(r) = -\beta(r) = -(r x y + y x r^*)$, $\mu(r) = (k x - x k)y - x(y k - k y)$ and $\nu(r) = s x y + x y s$. Hence, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta(r) + \alpha(r) = \lambda(r) + \mu(r) + \nu(r)$. Define $a_1(r) = k x - x k$, $b_1(r) = y$, $a_2(r) = -x$, $b_2(r) = y k - k y$, $\tilde{a}_1(r) = s$, $\tilde{b}_1(r) = x$, $\tilde{c}_1(r) = y$, $\tilde{a}_2(r) = x$, $\tilde{b}_2(r) = y$, $\tilde{c}_2(r) = s$. Therefore, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta(r) + \alpha(r) = \lambda(r) + \mu(r) + \nu(r) = \lambda(r) + a_1(r)b_1(r) + a_2(r)b_2(r) + \tilde{a}_1(r)\tilde{b}_1(r)\tilde{c}_1(r) + \tilde{a}_2(r)\tilde{b}_2(r)\tilde{c}_2(r)$.

Now, for $r \in R$, $r = 1r = ((xy - yx)z)r = (xy - yx)(zr)$ (here we use the right invertibility of $xy - yx$).

In our notations,

$$r = (xy - yx)(zr) = -\beta((zr)^*) + \alpha((zr)^*) = \lambda((zr)^*) + \mu((zr)^*) + \nu((zr)^*) = \lambda(zr)^* + a_1((zr)^*)b_1((zr)^*) + a_2((zr)^*)b_2((zr)^*) + \tilde{a}_1((zr)^*)\tilde{b}_1((zr)^*)\tilde{c}_1((zr)^*) + \tilde{a}_2((zr)^*)\tilde{b}_2((zr)^*)\tilde{c}_2((zr)^*).$$

So each element $r \in R$ can be written in the requested form. $\square$

Notice that Corollary 2.4 just says that in such a simple ring, each element $r \in R$ is in S^3 , hence can be written in the form $r = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} a_i b_i c_i$ with $a_i, b_i, c_i \in S$. However, it does not tell if there is any bound on m . But if $xy - yx$ is (not just non-zero, but also) right invertible, then there is a bound, namely 5, as (ii) of Proposition 2.7 shows. However, there are cases where a better bound than 5 can be given, for example, if $R = M_2(F)$ with the transpose involution, then 2 is a bound. This can be seen, for example, as follows: Let $R \ni r = a e_{11} + b e_{12} + c e_{21} + d e_{22}$.

$$r = (1/2)(r + r^*) + (1/2)(r - r^*) = [a e_{11} + (1/2)(b + c)e_{12} + (1/2)(b + c)e_{21} + d e_{22}] + [0 e_{11} + (1/2)(b - c)e_{12} + (1/2)(c - b)e_{21} + 0 e_{22}].$$

The first term, $[a e_{11} + (1/2)(b + c)e_{12} + (1/2)(b + c)e_{21} + d e_{22}]$ is in S . The second term, $[0 e_{11} + (1/2)(b - c)e_{12} + (1/2)(c - b)e_{21} + 0 e_{22}]$ is a product of two elements of S : the diagonal matrix $(1/2)(b - c)e_{11} + (1/2)(c - b)e_{22}$ and $e_{12} + e_{21}$.

Example 2.9. Let $R = M_n(F)$, where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2, $n > 1$. (ii) of Proposition 2.7 shows that:

- *The transpose involution:* Let $n = 2l$. Notice that, in contrast to Example 2.6, we now demand that n will be even. Then each element of R can be written in the form $\lambda + \mu + \nu$, where $\lambda \in S$, $\mu = a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2$, $\nu = \tilde{a}_1 \tilde{b}_1 \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{a}_2 \tilde{b}_2 \tilde{c}_2$, with $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{b}_2, \tilde{c}_2 \in S$ (By S we mean the symmetric elements wrt the transpose involution). Indeed, one can take $x = (e_{11} - e_{22}) + (e_{33} - e_{44}) + \dots + (e_{n-1, n-1} - e_{nn})$, $y = (e_{12} + e_{21}) + (e_{34} + e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{n-1, n} + e_{n, n-1})$.

Obviously, $x, y \in S$. A computation shows that $xy = (e_{12} - e_{21}) + (e_{34} - e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{n-1,n} - e_{n,n-1})$ and $yx = -xy$, so $xy - yx = 2xy = 2[(e_{12} - e_{21}) + (e_{34} - e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{n-1,n} - e_{n,n-1})]$. One sees that $xy - yx$ is invertible, so we can apply (ii) of Proposition 2.7.

A word of caution: If, for example, $n = 3$, then do not exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is invertible. Reason: $xy - yx \in K$, so $xy - yx = ae_{12} - ae_{21} + be_{13} - be_{31} + ce_{23} - ce_{32}$ for some $a, b, c \in F$. A direct computation shows that the determinant of $xy - yx$ is 0 (for example, working in the first column yields: $a(bc) - b(ac)$ which is, of course, 0).

This just shows that one cannot use (ii) of Proposition 2.7 to give an upper bound for the number of summands $a_i b_i c_i$ ($a_i, b_i, c_i \in S$) in the representation of $S^3 = R \ni r = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m(r)} a_i b_i c_i$ ($m(r)$ depends on r). The reader is invited to check and see what happens if $n \in \{5, 7, 9, \dots\}$.

- *The symplectic involution:* Let $n = 2m$, with $m = 2l$. Notice that, in contrast to Example 2.6, we now demand that m will be even. Then each element of R can be written in the form $\lambda + \mu + \nu$, where $\lambda \in S$, $\mu = a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2$, $\nu = \tilde{a}_1 \tilde{b}_1 \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{a}_2 \tilde{b}_2 \tilde{c}_2$, with $a_1, b_1, a_2, b_2, \tilde{a}_1, \tilde{b}_1, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{a}_2, \tilde{b}_2, \tilde{c}_2 \in S$ (By S we mean the symmetric elements wrt the symplectic involution). Indeed, one can take x as the blocks matrix with two equal blocks, each of the two blocks is an $m \times m$ ($m = 2l$) matrix of the form: $(e_{11} - e_{22}) + (e_{33} - e_{44}) + \dots + (e_{m-1,m-1} - e_{mm})$. And one can take y as the blocks matrix with two equal blocks, each of the two blocks is an $m \times m$ ($m = 2l$) matrix of the form: $(e_{12} + e_{21}) + (e_{34} + e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{m-1,m} + e_{m,m-1})$. Obviously, $x, y \in S$. A computation shows that $xy = (e_{12} - e_{21}) + (e_{34} - e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{n-1,n} - e_{n,n-1})$ and $yx = -xy$, so $xy - yx = 2xy = 2[(e_{12} - e_{21}) + (e_{34} - e_{43}) + \dots + (e_{n-1,n} - e_{n,n-1})]$. One sees that $xy - yx$ is invertible, so we can apply (ii) of Proposition 2.7. The reader is invited to check and see what happens if $m \in \{5, 7, 9, \dots\}$.

2.1.2. *A remark about the dimension of R .* For the next few results we will consider only a simple ring R . We would like to remark about the dimension of a simple R over $Z(R)$ (remember that the center of a simple ring is a field).

Theorem 2.10 (A theorem of Herstein). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra (F is of any characteristic) with an involution $*$ (not necessarily of the first kind) and assume $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then $\text{Cent}(S) \subseteq Z(R)$ (therefore, $\text{Cent}(S) = Z(R)$).*

Notice that if $S = R$, then the theorem is trivial, since $\text{Cent}(S) = \text{Cent}(R) = Z(R)$. Anyway, remember that at the beginning we have mentioned that we shall be interested in $S \subsetneq R$ (since if $S = R$, then $S^2 \supseteq S = R$).

Proof. This is Theorem 1.7 in Herstein's book [1]. □

As a corollary to the above theorem we have:

Corollary 2.11. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Also assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then, S is a commutative set $\Leftrightarrow Z(R) = S$.*

Notice that apriori, if $Z(R) \subsetneq S$, then S could be commutative or not, but this corollary says that S must be noncommutative.

Proof. Of course if $S = Z(R)$ then S is commutative (moreover, S is not just a commutative set, but a field). As for the other direction, assume that S is a commutative set. Then $S \subseteq \text{Cent}(S)$. Now use Herstein's theorem 2.10, so $S \subseteq \text{Cent}(S) \subseteq Z(R)$. Finally, since $*$ is of the first kind (namely $Z(R) \subseteq S$), we get $S \subseteq \text{Cent}(S) \subseteq Z(R) \subseteq S$. Therefore, $S = Z(R)$. $\square$

In view of this, one has:

Theorem 2.12. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then $S^3 = R$.*

Proof. By assumption, $Z(R) \subsetneq S$, so from Corollary 2.11 we get that S is noncommutative. Now Corollary 2.4 implies that $S^3 = R$. $\square$

Notice that one can apply Corollary 2.4 to $M_2(F)$ with the transpose involution, where $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$ (there is no restriction on the dimension of R over $Z(R)$), while Theorem 2.12 cannot be applied, since $\dim_{Z(M_2(F))} M_2(F) = 4$.

2.2. Results about S^2 . However, Herstein's question dealt with S^2 and not S^3 . Therefore, we shall bring two possible criteria, each shows when $R = S^2$ (R is a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. $*$ is an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. S is not a commutative set). The first criterion says: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$ if and only if $S^2 = R$, see Theorem 2.20. The second criterion says: There exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xyk \in S^2$ if and only if $S^2 = R$, see Theorem 2.26. Those results are true without any restriction on the dimension of R over $Z(R)$.

2.2.1. First criterion. We start with two lemmas, similar to Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2.

Lemma 2.13. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Then for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2$. In other words, the right ideal $(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^2 .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r \in R$ $(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^2$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$: For every $r \in R$, $rx y + xy r^* = rx y + yxr^* - yxr^* + xy r^*$ (we just added and subtracted $yx r^*$). Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rx y + xy r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rx y + yxr^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta + (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim: $\alpha \in S^2$, $\beta \in S$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in S$, since $(\beta)^* = (rx y + yxr^*)^* = yxr^* + rx y = \beta$. As for α : Of course, given $r \in R$, r can be written as $r = s + k$ where $s \in S$ and $k \in K$. $\alpha = rx y + xy r^* = (s + k)xy + xy(s - k) = (sxy + xys) + (kxy - xyk) = (sxy + xys) + [(kx - xk)y - x(yk - ky)]$.

We show now that $sxy + xys \in S^2$: $sxy + xys = (sx + xs)y + x(y s + sy) - 2xsy$. But, $sx + xs \in S$, $y \in S$, $x \in S$, $ys + sy \in S$, and $-2xsy \in S^2$ (just by our assumption that for every $\tilde{s} \in S$, $x\tilde{s}y \in S^2$), concluding that $sxy + xys \in S^2$. $(kx - xk)y - x(yk - ky) \in S^2$ since $kx - xk, y, x, yk - ky \in S$.

Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = \alpha - \beta \in S^2$ (remember that $S \subseteq S^2$). But $R = R^*$ (since $r = (r^*)^*$), so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2$. (We could, of course, from the first place take $r^*xy + xyr = r^*xy + yxr - yxr + xyr$ instead of $rx y + xyr^* = rx y + yxr^* - yxr^* + xyr^*$, and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in S^2$). Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^2$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 2.13 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. However, in contrast to what we have seen in the above section about S^3 (noncommutativity of S implies that S^3 contains a non-zero right ideal of R), noncommutativity of S does not imply that S^2 contains a non-zero right ideal of R . But, if those $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ also satisfy $xSy \subseteq S^2$ (this means that for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$), then S^2 contains a non-zero right ideal of R (namely, $(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2$).

Lemma 2.14. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Then for every $r, u \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in S^2$. In other words, the two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^2 .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r, u \in R$ $u(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^2$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$:

Claim: for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^2$, $wu - uw \in S^2$ (in other words, S^2 is a Lie ideal of R). It is enough to show that for every $a, b \in S$, $abu - uab \in S^2$ (indeed, if for every $a_i, b_i \in S$, $a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i \in S^2$, then taking $S^2 \ni w = \sum a_i b_i$, we get $wu - uw = (\sum a_i b_i)u - u(\sum a_i b_i) = \sum (a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i)$, so since each $a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i \in S^2$, we get $wu - uw = \dots = \sum (a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i) \in S^2$). Now, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b$. Clearly, $bu + u^*b, ua + au^* \in S$, concluding that $abu - uab \in S^2$. So we have proved the claim that for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^2$, $wu - uw \in S^2$.

Next, the above lemma, Lemma 2.13, says that for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u - u((xy - yx)r) \in S^2$. Use again the above lemma to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in S^2$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $-u((xy - yx)r) \in S^2$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^2$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 2.14 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. However, in contrast to what we have seen in the above section about S^3 (noncommutativity of S implies that S^3 contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R), noncommutativity of S does not imply that S^2 contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R . But, if those $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ also satisfy $xSy \subseteq S^2$, then S^2 contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R (namely, $R(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2$). Next, similarly to Theorem 2.3 which dealt with S^3 , we have the following theorem which deals with S^2 .

Theorem 2.15. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Then there exists a non-zero two-sided ideal of R which is contained in S^2 .*

Remark 2.16. *Of course the assumption that S is not a commutative set implies that there exists $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. Here we demand more; we demand to find such non commute $x, y \in S$ with $xsy \in S^2$ for every $s \in S$ (by definition of S^3 , $xsy \in S^3$ for every $s \in S$).*

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 2.14, as was explained immediately after it. $\square$

Similarly to Theorem 2.3 and its corollary, we have as a corollary:

Corollary 2.17 (Second step towards an answer to Herstein's question- A first criterion). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Then $S^2 = R$.*

Proof. Follows at once from Theorem 2.15. $\square$

Remark 2.18. *Let R be as in Corollary 2.17. If $\dim_F(R) = n\infty$, then $n > \dim_F(S) \geq n^{1/2}$: Indeed, $\dim_F(R) = \dim_F(S^2) \leq (\dim_F(S))^2$ (the first equality is true since $R = S^2$). Therefore, $n \leq (\dim_F(S))^2$, so $\dim_F(S) \geq n^{1/2}$.*

If one wonders if the condition that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$ is satisfied by matrices, then the answer is yes, as the next example shows.

Example 2.19 (Major example: Matrices over a field). *Let $R = M_n(F)$, where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2 and $n > 1$. Corollary 2.17 can be applied for both the transpose involution and the symplectic involution on $M_n(F)$, thus showing that in each of these two cases $S^2 = R$. Indeed;*

- *The transpose involution: For any $n \geq 2$, take $x = 1e_11 - 1e_22$, $y = 1e_12 + 1e_21$ (where all the other components are zero). It is easily seen that $x, y \in S$. $xy = 1e_12 - 1e_21$ and $yx = -xy$, so $xy - yx = 2xy = 2e_12 - 2e_21 \neq 0$. Denote any $s \in S$ by $s = ae_11 + be_12 + be_21 + de_22 + \dots$ (one can see that the other components are not important in the computation of xsy , so we do not bother to write them). A direct computation shows that $xsy = be_11 + ae_12 - de_21 - be_22$. xsy is indeed in S^2 : $xsy = (be_11 - be_22) + (ae_12 - de_21)$. The first term $be_11 - be_22$ is obviously in S . As for the second term: $ae_12 - de_21 = (ae_11 - de_22)(1e_12 + 1e_21)$, obviously $ae_11 - de_22 \in S$ and $1e_12 + 1e_21 \in S$, so $ae_12 - de_21 \in S^2$. Therefore, $XSy \subseteq S^2$ and Corollary 2.17 can be applied.*
- *The symplectic involution: For any $n = 2m \geq 4$ (remember that if $n = 2$, then $S \cong F$, so $S^2 = S \cong F \subsetneq R$), take $x = 1e_{1,m+2} - 1e_{2,m+1}$, $y = 1e_12 + 1e_{m+2,m+1}$ (where all the other components are zero). It is easily seen that $x, y \in S$. $xy = 1e_{1,m+1}$ and $yx = -xy$, so $xy - yx = 2xy = 2e_{1,m+1} \neq 0$. Denote any $s \in S$ by $s = (a_{ij})$. A direct computation shows that $xsy = A + B + C$ where $A = a_{m+2,1}e_{12}$, $B = a_{22}e_{1,m+1}$, $C = -a_{21}e_{2,m+1}$. It is not difficult to see that $e_{12}, e_{1,m+1}, e_{2,m+1} \in S^2$. Indeed,*

$$\begin{aligned}
& - (e_{11} + e_{m+1,m+1})(e_{12} + e_{m+2,m+1}) = e_{11}e_{12} + e_{11}e_{m+2,m+1} + e_{m+1,m+1}e_{12} + \\
& \quad e_{m+1,m+1}e_{m+2,m+1} = e_{12}, \text{ so } e_{12} \in S^2 \text{ (of course, } e_{11} + e_{m+1,m+1} \in S). \\
& - xy = (e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1})(e_{12} + e_{m+2,m+1}) = e_{1,m+2}e_{12} + e_{1,m+2}e_{m+2,m+1} - \\
& \quad e_{2,m+1}e_{12} - e_{2,m+1}e_{m+2,m+1} = e_{1,m+1}. \\
& - (e_{22} + e_{m+2,m+2})x = (e_{22} + e_{m+2,m+2})(e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1}) = e_{22}e_{1,m+2} - \\
& \quad e_{22}e_{2,m+1} + e_{m+2,m+2}e_{1,m+2} - e_{m+2,m+2}e_{2,m+1} = -e_{2,m+1} \text{ (of course, } e_{22} + \\
& \quad e_{m+2,m+2} \in S).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence xy is indeed in S^2 . Therefore, $xSy \subseteq S^2$ and Corollary 2.17 can be applied.

Now it is time to bring the following criterion for $S^2 = R$, which is just a combination of Corollary 2.4 and of Corollary 2.17.

Theorem 2.20 (A first possible criterion for a positive answer to Herstein's question). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then: there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$.*

Proof. • $\Rightarrow$: If there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, then Corollary 2.17 says that $S^2 = R$.

• $\Leftarrow$: Since S is not a commutative set, there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. $S^2 = R$ so every element $r \in R$ is in S^2 , in particular, for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in R = S^2$. Another way to see this direction: Otherwise, for every $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, exists $s(x, y) \in S$ such that $xs(x, y)y \notin S^2$. Now since S is not a commutative set there do exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. Therefore, for this pair x, y exists $s(x, y) \in S$ such that $xs(x, y)y \notin S^2$. But by definition of S^3 , $xs(x, y)y \in S^3$, so we have $S^2 \subsetneq S^3$. Finally, Corollary 2.4 says that $S^3 = R$, so $S^2 \subsetneq S^3 = R$.

□

Remark 2.21 (Possible criterion in practice). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. The first possible criterion says that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$. However, given such an algebra, in order to show that $S^2 \neq R$, it is enough to find $x, y, s \in S$ such that $xsy \notin S^2$, which seems a little easier than to find for every noncommuting $x, y \in S$, an element (which depends on these x, y) $s = s(x, y)$ such that $xs(x, y)y \notin S^2$. Indeed, otherwise for any triple $s_1, s_2, s_3 \in S$ $s_1s_2s_3 \in S^2$, hence $S^3 \subseteq S^2$, so (since $S^3 \supseteq S^2$) $S^3 = S^2$. But Corollary 2.4 says that $S^3 = R$, therefore $S^2 = R$.*

Notice that there is no restriction on $\dim_{Z(R)} R$ (we can have $\dim_{Z(R)} R = 4$, as in $M_2(F)$ with the transpose involution, $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$); Again, if we insist that $\dim_{Z(R)} R$ will enter our results, then we may have the following:

Corollary 2.22. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then: there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$.*

Proof. • $\Rightarrow$: If there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, then Corollary 2.17 says that $S^2 = R$.
 • $\Leftarrow$: From Corollary 2.11 S is not a commutative set. Now proceed exactly as in the proof of Theorem 2.20. □

If one prefers to dismiss of the condition that R is simple, but still have $S^2 = R$, then we offer the following. A word of caution: There is a difference between (ii) of Proposition 2.7 and (ii) of the following proposition, Proposition 2.23; In (ii) of Proposition 2.7 we give an upper bound for the number of monomials of length 3 in the representation of every element $r \in R$, namely: 5 monomials at most are needed. However, in (ii) of Proposition 2.23 we do not give an upper bound for the number of monomials of length 2 in the representation of every element $r \in R$. We only know that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Generally, $xsy \in S^2$ just tell us that $xsy = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m(s)} a_i b_i$ where $a_i, b_i \in S$ and $m = m(s)$ can be any finite number (which depends on the particular $s \in S$). If there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $s \in S$, $m(s) \leq M$, then it is possible to give an upper bound for the number of monomials of length 2 in the representation of every element $r \in R$, namely $M + 5$ monomials at most are needed.

Proposition 2.23. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then,*

- (i) *Assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, and 1 can be written as $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} u_i(xy - yx)v_i$ where $u_i, v_i \in R$. Then $S^2 = R$.*
- (ii) *Assume that a stronger condition then the condition in (i) is satisfied, namely, that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. Also assume that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $s \in S$, $xsy = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} a_i(s)b_i(s)$ where $a_i(s), b_i(s) \in S$.*

Then (in addition to $S^2 = R$) each element of R can be written in the form $\lambda + \mu$, where $\lambda \in S$, $\mu = a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2 + \dots + a_{M+3} b_{M+3} + a_{M+4} b_{M+4}$, with $a_1, b_1, \dots, a_{M+4}, b_{M+4} \in S$.

Proof. (i) Write $1 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} u_i(xy - yx)v_i$ where $u_i, v_i \in R$ and $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$. This of course implies that the non-zero two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ equals R . But from Lemma 2.14, $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^2 . Therefore, $S^2 = R$.

- (ii) By assumption there exists $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, so there exists $z \in R$ such that $(xy - yx)z = 1$. For every $r \in R$, $rx y + x y r^* = r x y + y x r^* - y x r^* + x y r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = r x y + y x r^*$. So for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = \alpha(r) - \beta(r)$. We have seen in the proof of Lemma 2.13 that $\beta(r) \in S$ and $\alpha(r) \in S^2$. More elaborately for $\alpha(r)$, we have seen that if $r = s + k$ with $s \in S$ and $k \in K$: $\alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^* = \dots = (s x y + x y s) + [(k x - x k)y - x(y k - k y)] = (s x + x s)y + x(y s + s y) - 2 x s y + [(k x - x k)y - x(y k - k y)] = (s x + x s)y + x(y s + s y) - 2[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} a_i(s)b_i(s)] + [(k x - x k)y - x(y k - k y)]$, where we have used the extra assumption that there exists $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for every $s \in S$, $xsy = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} a_i(s)b_i(s)$ where $a_i(s), b_i(s) \in S$. So denote: $\lambda(r) = -\beta(r) = -(r x y + y x r^*) \in S$, $\mu(r) = \alpha(r) = (s x + x s)y + x(y s +$

$sy) - 2[\sum_{1 \leq i \leq M} a_i(s)b_i(s)] + [(kx - xk)y - x(yk - ky)]$. Hence, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta(r) + \alpha(r) = \lambda(r) + \mu(r)$. Define $a_1(r) = kx - xk, b_1(r) = y, a_2(r) = -x, b_2(r) = yk - ky, a_3(r) = sx + xs, b_3(r) = y, a_4(r) = x, b_4(r) = ys + sy, a_5(r) = a_1(s), b_5(r) = b_1(s), a_6(r) = a_2(s), b_6(r) = b_2(s), \dots, a_{M+4}(r) = a_M(s), b_{M+4}(r) = b_M(s)$. Therefore, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta(r) + \alpha(r) = \lambda(r) + \mu(r) = \lambda(r) + a_1(r)b_1(r) + a_2(r)b_2(r) + \dots + a_{M+4}(r)b_{M+4}(r)$. Now, for $r \in R$, $r = 1r = ((xy - yx)z)r = (xy - yx)(zr)$ (here we use the right invertibility of $xy - yx$).

In our notations,

$r = (xy - yx)(zr) = -\beta((zr)^*) + \alpha((zr)^*) = \lambda((zr)^*) + \mu((zr)^*) = \lambda(zr)^* + a_1((zr)^*)b_1((zr)^*) + a_2((zr)^*)b_2((zr)^*) + \dots + a_{M+4}((zr)^*)b_{M+4}((zr)^*)$. So each element $r \in R$ can be written in the requested form. $\square$

Example 2.24. Let $R = M_n(F)$, where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2, $n > 1$. As for (ii) of Proposition 2.23 one must be careful:

- The transpose involution: For $n = 2$, if one takes x and y as in Example 2.19, namely $x = 1e_11 - 1e_22$ and $y = 1e_12 + 1e_21$, then $xy - yx$ is invertible, $xSy \subseteq S^2$ and 2 is such that for every $s \in S$, $xsy = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 2} a_i(s)b_i(s)$ where $a_i(s), b_i(s) \in S$. Therefore, we can use (ii) of Proposition 2.23. However, for $n > 2$ for those x and y , $xy - yx$ is not invertible.
- The symplectic involution: For $n = 2m \geq 4$, let x and y be as in Example 2.19, namely $x = 1e_{1,m+2} - 1e_{2,m+1}$, $y = 1e_12 + 1e_{m+2,m+1}$. $xy - yx$ is not invertible.

This only shows that the particular x and y of the transpose involution and the particular x and y of the symplectic involution from Example 2.19, do not satisfy (ii) of Proposition 2.23.

We would like to remark about the dimension of a simple R over $Z(R)$. Unfortunately, we are not able to give an analog theorem to Theorem 2.12. Namely, if R is a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$, $*$ is an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$), $S \subsetneq R$ and $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$, then not necessarily that $S^2 = R$ (remember that Theorem 2.12 says that $S^3 = R$). This is because Corollary 2.11 just says that S is a noncommutative set (since $Z(R) \subsetneq S$), but it does not say that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2$. In order to use Corollary 2.17 we need to find $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2$. If we insist that $\dim_{Z(R)} R$ will enter our results, then we may have the following. However, it is just Corollary 2.17 with " $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ " instead of " S is not a commutative set".

Theorem 2.25. Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq S^2$. Then $S^2 = R$.

We have seen in corollary 2.17 that if R is a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$, $*$ is an involution on R of the first kind, $S \subsetneq R$ and there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, then $S^2 = R$. However, one can

give other criteria for $S^2 = R$. We shall bring now another possible criterion for S^2 to equal R . Notice that we continue to assume that S is not a commutative set. Also notice that in the following criterion the particular $x, y \in S$ satisfy $xy + yx \neq 0$. We can follow the same path as in the first criterion, namely: starting with two lemmas (similar to Lemma 2.13 and Lemma 2.14), then bringing a theorem and its corollary (similar to Theorem 2.15 and Corollary 2.17) and finally bringing the criterion (similar to Theorem 2.20). However, for the sake of brevity, we bring all the results in one theorem, namely the second possible criterion.

Theorem 2.26 (A second possible criterion for a positive answer to Herstein's question). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then: there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2 \Leftrightarrow S^2 = R$.*

Observe that reading the proof reveals that it is enough to demand that $xT_0y \subseteq S^2$ which is a little weaker condition than $xKy \subseteq S^2$. However, in Lemma 2.13 we could not say that reading the proof reveals that it is enough to demand that $xTy \subseteq S^2$ (instead of $xSy \subseteq S^2$).

Proof. • $\Rightarrow$: Assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2$. We must show that $S^2 = R$. For every $r \in R$, $rx y - x y r^* = r x y + y x r^* - y x r^* - x y r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = r x y - x y r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = r x y + y x r^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta - (xy + yx)r^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in S^2$, $\beta \in S$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in S$, since $(\beta)^* = (r x y + y x r^*)^* = y x r^* + r x y = \beta$. As for α : $\alpha = r x y - x y r^* = (r x + x r^*)y - x(y r^* + r y) - x r^* y + x r y = (r x + x r^*)y - x(y r^* + r y) - x(r^* - r)y$. Clearly, $r x + x r^*, y, -x, y r^* + r y \in S$. $r^* - r \in K$, so $x(r^* - r)y \in S^2$ (just by our assumption that $xKy \subseteq S^2$). Therefore, $\alpha = r x y - x y r^* = (r x + x r^*)y - x(y r^* + r y) - x(r^* - r)y \in S^2$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $-(xy + yx)r^* = \alpha - \beta \in S^2$ (remember that $S \subseteq S^2$). But $R = R^*$ (since $r = (r^*)^*$), so for every $r \in R$, $-(xy + yx)r \in S^2$. Then, obviously, for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in S^2$ (Of course, from the first place we could take $-r^*$ instead of r , and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy + yx)r \in S^2$). Therefore, $(xy + yx)R \subseteq S^2$. Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^2$, $wu - uw \in S^2$ (in other words, S^2 is a Lie ideal of R). We have already seen this claim in the proof of Lemma 2.14. Next, for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in S^2$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy + yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy + yx)r)u - u((xy + yx)r) \in S^2$. Use again $(xy + yx)R \subseteq S^2$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy + yx)r)u = (xy + yx)ru \in S^2$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $-u((xy + yx)r) \in S^2$. So $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq S^2$. By assumption, $xy + yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy + yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R ($0 \neq xy + yx = 1(xy + yx)1 \in R(xy + yx)R$). R is simple, so $R(xy + yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq S^2$, hence $R = S^2$.

• $\Leftarrow$: Assume that $S^2 = R$. Let $x = y = 1$. So we have found $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx = 2 \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $(k = 1k1 =)xky \in S^2$ ($S^2 = R$ so every element $r \in R$ is in S^2 , in particular, for every $k \in K$, $xky \in R = S^2$).

□

Similarly to Example 2.19, we have here:

Example 2.27. Let $R = M_n(F)$, where F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2 and $n > 1$. Theorem 2.26 can be applied for both the transpose involution and the symplectic involution on $M_n(F)$, thus showing that in each of these two cases $S^2 = R$. Indeed;

- *The transpose involution:* Let $n \geq 2$. Take $x = e_{11}$, $y = e_{12} + e_{21}$. One sees that $x, y \in S$ and $xy + yx = e_{11}(e_{12} + e_{21}) + (e_{12} + e_{21})e_{11} = e_{12} + e_{21} = y \neq 0$. A direct computation shows that if $K \ni (a_{ij}) = k = ae_{12} - ae_{21} + \dots$, then $xky = ae_{11}$. Indeed, $x(ae_{12} - e_{21} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j} + \sum_{j \neq 1} a_{2j} + \sum_{i > 3} \sum j a_{ij})y = (e_{11}(ae_{12} - e_{21} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{1j} + \sum_{j \neq 1} a_{2j}e_{2j} + \sum_{i > 3} \sum j a_{ij}e_{ij}))(e_{12} + e_{21}) = (ae_{11}e_{12} - e_{11}e_{21} + e_{11} \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{1j} + e_{11} \sum_{j \neq 1} a_{2j}e_{2j} + e_{11} \sum_{i > 3} \sum j a_{ij}e_{ij})(e_{12} + e_{21}) = (ae_{12} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{11}e_{1j})(e_{12} + e_{21}) = (ae_{12} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{1j})(e_{12} + e_{21}) = ae_{12}e_{12} + ae_{12}e_{21} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{1j}e_{12} + \sum_{j \neq 2} a_{1j}e_{1j}e_{21} = ae_{11} + a_{11}e_{11}e_{12} = ae_{11} + a_{11}e_{12} = ae_{11} + 0e_{12} = ae_{11}$ (of course $a_{11} = 0$ since $(a_{ij}) = k \in K$). Clearly, $ae_{11} \in S \subseteq S^2$, so $xKy \subseteq S^2$. Therefore, Theorem 2.26 can be applied.
- *The symplectic involution:* Let $n = 2m \geq 4$ (remember that when $n = 2$, S is commutative, actually $S \cong F$, so $S^2 = S \subsetneq R$). Take $x = e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1}$, $y = e_{11} + e_{m+1,m+1}$. One sees that $x, y \in S$.

$$xy = (e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1})(e_{11} + e_{m+1,m+1}) = e_{1,m+2}e_{11} + e_{1,m+2}e_{m+1,m+1} - e_{2,m+1}e_{11} - e_{2,m+1}e_{m+1,m+1} = -e_{2,m+1}e_{m+1,m+1} = -e_{2,m+1}.$$

$$yx = (e_{11} + e_{m+1,m+1})(e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1}) = e_{11}e_{1,m+2} = e_{1,m+2}.$$

Hence, $xy + yx = -e_{2,m+1} + e_{1,m+2} \neq 0$. A direct computation shows that if $K \ni (a_{ij}) = k$, then $xky = a_{m+2,1}e_{11} - a_{m+1,1}e_{21} + a_{m+2,m+1}e_{1,m+1} - a_{m+1,m+1}e_{2,m+1}$. Each of the four terms is in S^2 :

- e_{11} : We only show that for $n = 4$ $e_{11} \in S^2$. $e_{11} = (1/4)(A + B + 2C - D)$, where $A = e_{11} - e_{22} + e_{33} - e_{44}$, $B = e_{11} + e_{22}$, $C = e_{11} + e_{44}$, $D = e_{33} + e_{44}$. Indeed, $(1/4)[(e_{11} - e_{22} + e_{33} - e_{44}) + (e_{11} + e_{22}) + 2(e_{11} + e_{44}) - (e_{33} + e_{44})] = (1/4)[e_{11} - e_{22} + e_{33} - e_{44} + e_{11} + e_{22} + 2e_{11} + 2e_{44} - e_{33} - e_{44}] = (1/4)[4e_{11}] = e_{11}$. It is not difficult to see that $A, B, C, D \in S^2$:

$$* A \in S.$$

$$* (e_{14} - e_{23})(e_{41} - e_{32}) = e_{14}e_{41} - e_{14}e_{32} - e_{23}e_{41} + e_{23}e_{32} = e_{11} + e_{22} = B.$$

$$* (e_{12} + e_{43})(e_{12} + e_{21} + e_{34} + e_{43}) = e_{12}e_{12} + e_{12}e_{21} + e_{12}e_{34} + e_{12}e_{43} + e_{43}e_{12} + e_{43}e_{21} + e_{43}e_{34} + e_{43}e_{43} = e_{11} + e_{44} = C.$$

$$* (e_{41} - e_{32})(e_{14} - e_{23}) = e_{41}e_{14} - e_{41}e_{23} - e_{32}e_{14} + e_{32}e_{23} = e_{44} + e_{33} = D.$$

- (For any $n = 2m \leq 4$): $(e_{22} + e_{m+2,m+2})(e_{21} + e_{m+1,m+2}) = e_{22}e_{21} + e_{22}e_{m+1,m+2} + e_{m+2,m+2}e_{21} + e_{m+2,m+2}e_{m+1,m+2} = e_{22}e_{21} = e_{21}$.

- (For any $n = 2m \leq 4$): $e_{1,m+1}, e_{2,m+1}$: we have already seen in Example 2.19 that $e_{1,m+1}, e_{2,m+1} \in S^2$. Just for convenience we show this again: $(e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1})(e_{12} + e_{m+2,m+1}) = e_{1,m+2}e_{12} + e_{1,m+2}e_{m+2,m+1} - e_{2,m+1}e_{12} - e_{2,m+1}e_{m+2,m+1} = e_{1,m+1}$. $(e_{22} + e_{m+2,m+2})(e_{1,m+2} - e_{2,m+1}) = e_{22}e_{1,m+2} - e_{22}e_{2,m+1} + e_{m+2,m+2}e_{1,m+2} - e_{m+2,m+2}e_{2,m+1} = -e_{2,m+1}$.

So $xKy \subseteq S^2$. Therefore, Theorem 2.26 can be applied.

We do not bother to bring a result when R is not necessarily a simple ring, but there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx$ is right invertible and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2$

(similar to Proposition 2.23) or to bring a result when R is simple and $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ (similar to Corollary 2.22). It is not difficult to complete the details and have such results.

3. OTHER RESULTS

One can continue in the spirit of the theorems seen thus far and get further results concerning S and K . R will continue to denote an associative F -algebra with 1 and with an involution $*$ such that:

- F is a field of characteristic not equal to 2 (hence $R = S + K$).
- The involution $*$ is of the first kind, namely, $Z(R) \subseteq S$ (hence $S \subseteq S^2 \subseteq S^3$ etc.).
- $S \subsetneq R$. (Remember that if $S = R$, then $S^3 \supseteq S^2 \supseteq S = R$ so $S^3 = R$ and $S^2 = R$. We on purpose wrote separately $S^3 = R$ and $S^2 = R$ in order to emphasize what happens for S^3 and what happens for S^2).

However, in this section we shall consider subsets of R other than S^3 and S^2 :

- (i) In the first subsection we shall mainly consider K^6 , K^4 , $K + KSK$ and $KS + K^2$. The results about K^6 and K^4 follow immediately from results of Herstein and from our results. For $K + KSK$ to equal R , we assume that K is not a skew-commutative set. For $KS + K^2$ (or $SK + K^2$) to equal R , we assume that there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq K^2$ (so in particular we assume that K is not a skew-commutative set). Notice the similarity to the second criterion which says that if there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xKy \subseteq S^2$, then $S^2 = R$. Another option for $KS + K^2$ to equal R is when there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq K^2$. We also consider $K + K^2$, $K + K^2 + K^3$ and $K + K^3$.
- (ii) In the second subsection, in analogy to S^3 , we shall consider SKS and $K + KS + SK \subseteq SKS$. Notice that if $S = R$, then (from $S \cap K = 0$) $K = 0$, hence $SKS = 0 \subsetneq R$ (in contrast to $S^3 = R$), so there is nothing interesting to say about SKS or $K + KS + SK$ (both are zero).
- (iii) In the third subsection, again in analogy to S^3 , we shall consider S^2K (and $SK \subseteq S^2K$) and KS^2 (and $KS \subseteq KS^2$). Notice that if $S = R$ then $K = 0$, hence $S^2K = 0 \subsetneq R$ and $KS^2 = 0 \subsetneq R$ (in contrast to $S^3 = R$), so there is nothing interesting to say.

3.1. Results mostly about K^6 , K^4 , $K + KSK$, $KS + K^2$.

3.1.1. *An almost analog theorem for K^6 and K^4 .* We give a result dealing exclusively with K instead of S , which follows immediately from two theorems of Herstein. Of course, when we have dealt with S we had $S \subseteq S^2 \subseteq S^3$, however for K we usually do not have such a chain of inclusions (Notice that in $M_2(F)$ with the symplectic involution, $K \subsetneq K^2 = M_2(F)$, so we do have a chain of inclusions). A combination of Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 of Herstein (see [1]) implies the next theorem. Observe that in Herstein's Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3:

- There is no demand for S to be a noncommutative set.
- $S \subsetneq R$ is an implicit demand, since if $S = R$, then from $S \cap K = 0$, one gets $K = 0$, so $\bar{K} = 0 \subsetneq R$.

Theorem 3.1 (Herstein). *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$ and $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Then, $R = K + (K \circ K)$.*

If one wishes to express R as K^n for some $n \geq 2$ instead of $K + (K \circ K)$ ($K + (K \circ K)$ is not contained in K^2 , only $K \circ K$ is contained in K^2), then one may express R as follows:

Theorem 3.2. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then,*

- $K^6 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^3 = R$.
- If, in addition, exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, then $K^4 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^2 = R$. (If, in addition, exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2$, then $K^4 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^2 = R$).

Proof. Use Theorem 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 of Herstein (see [1]) (or the above Theorem 3.1) and get that in our R , $S = K \circ K$.

- From Corollary 2.4 $S^3 = R$, so $K^6 = (K^2)^3 \supseteq (K \circ K)^3 = S^3 = R$.
- From Corollary 2.17 $S^2 = R$, so $K^4 = (K^2)^2 \supseteq (K \circ K)^2 = S^2 = R$. (From Theorem 2.26 $S^2 = R$, so $K^4 = (K^2)^2 \supseteq (K \circ K)^2 = S^2 = R$).

□

Using Corollary 2.11, Theorem 3.2 can be written as:

Theorem 3.3. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind with $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then,*

- $K^6 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^3 = R$.
- If, in addition, exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$, $xsy \in S^2$, then $K^4 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^2 = R$. (If, in addition, exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in S^2$, then $K^4 = R$, or more specifically $(K \circ K)^2 = R$).

Proof. • Use Theorem 2.12.

- Use Theorem 2.25. (Clear).

□

Remark 3.4 ($K^2 = R$ and $\dim_{Z(R)} R = 4$). *In Theorem 3.2 we have assumed that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ and got $K^6 = R$ or $K^4 = R$. For $\dim_{Z(R)} R = 4$, already K^2 may equal R :*

- $R = \mathbb{H} = \mathbb{R} + \mathbb{R}i + \mathbb{R}j + \mathbb{R}k$. $S = \mathbb{R}$, $K = \mathbb{R}i + \mathbb{R}j + \mathbb{R}k$. $K^2 = \mathbb{H}$, because:
 - $S \subseteq K^2$: $-1 = ii \in K^2$, so for every $\epsilon \in S = \mathbb{R}$, $\epsilon = (-\epsilon)(-1) \in K^2$ (K^2 is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$).
 - $K \subseteq K^2$: $i = jk \in K^2$, $j = ki \in K^2$, $k = ij \in K^2$, so since K^2 is a vector space over $\mathbb{R}$, $K = \mathbb{R}i + \mathbb{R}j + \mathbb{R}k \in K^2$.

So, $\mathbb{H} = S + K \subseteq K^2$, hence $\mathbb{H} = K^2$.

- $R = M_2(F)$ with the symplectic involution. $S = \{a(e_{11} + e_{22}) | a \in F\}$, $K = \{a(e_{11} - e_{22}) + be_{12} + ce_{21} | a, b, c \in F\}$ (in other words, the matrices with zero traces). A computation shows that $K^2 = R$; Indeed,
 - $e_{12}e_{21} = e_{11}$. $e_{12}, e_{21} \in K$, so $e_{11} \in K^2$.
 - $(e_{11} - e_{22})e_{12} = e_{11}e_{12} - e_{22}e_{12} = e_{12}$. $(e_{11} - e_{22}), e_{12} \in K$, so $e_{12} \in K^2$.
 - $(e_{11} - e_{22})(-e_{21}) = -e_{11}e_{21} + e_{22}e_{21} = e_{21}$. $(e_{11} - e_{22}), -e_{21} \in K$, so $e_{21} \in K^2$.
 - $e_{21}e_{12} = e_{22}$. $e_{21}, e_{12} \in K$, so $e_{22} \in K^2$.

3.1.2. *Results about $K + KSK$.* Herstein's theorem says that if R is a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$, $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$, $*$ is an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$, then $R = K + (K \circ K)$ (hence $R = K + K^2$, since $R = K + (K \circ K) \subseteq K + K^2$). We shall bring a weaker version of Herstein's theorem, namely Theorem 3.6. In Theorem 3.6 we will only get that $R = K + KSK$, so our result is weaker than Herstein's in the sense that we show that R equals $K + KSK$ which contains $K + K^2 \supseteq K + (K \circ K)$. Notice that we will not assume that S is not a commutative set. Also notice that in Theorem 3.6 we will not assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$, but we will assume that there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$, namely, K is not a skew-commutative set.

Remark 3.5. *Actually, if $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$ (and, as usual, $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$) then K is necessarily not a skew-commutative set. This result is immediate from Herstein's theorem 3.1: Assume that K is skew-commutative. Then for every $a, b \in K$, $(ab)^* = (b^*)(a^*) = (-b)(-a) = ba = -ab$, so $(ab + ba)^* = -ab - ba = -(ab + ba)$. Therefore, (merely by the definition of $K \circ K$ as the F -subspace of R generated by $ab + ba$ where $a, b \in K$), $(K \circ K) \subseteq K$. Now, from Herstein's theorem $R = K + (K \circ K) \subseteq K + K = K$, so $R = K$. But this is impossible, since on the one hand $1 \in R = K$, so $1^* = -1$. On the other hand $1 \in F \subseteq Z(R) \subset S$, so $1^* = 1$. Combining the two yields $-1 = 1$ hence $1 + 1 = 0$, but by assumption $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. However, here we wish that our theorems will not rely on Herstein's, so we will assume (also when $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$) that K is not a skew-commutative set. Without Herstein's theorem we are only able to show the following: Let R be an associative F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R (and $S \subsetneq R$). If K is a skew-commutative set, then for every $k \in K$, $k^2 = 0$. Indeed, take $k \in K$. K is skew-commutative, hence, in particular, $kk = -kk$. Therefore $2kk = kk + kk = 0$, so $kk = 0$ (by assumption, $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$). Therefore, if there exists $k \in K$ such that $k^2 \neq 0$, then K is not a skew-commutative set. This assumption seems reasonable, at least in some special cases, for example if R is also a domain. Indeed, if R is also a domain, then necessarily exists $k \in K$ such that $k^2 \neq 0$; Otherwise, for every $k \in K$, $k^2 = 0$. But each $k \neq 0$ is regular, so $K = 0$. This implies $S = R$, a contradiction to our usual assumption that $S \subsetneq R$.*

Theorem 3.6. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that K is not a skew-commutative set. Then $R = K + KSK$.*

Proof. K is not a skew-commutative set, hence there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy \neq -yx$. Hence $xy + yx \neq 0$. For every $r \in R$, $rx y + x y r^* = r x y - y x r^* + y x r^* + x y r^* = r x y - y x r^* + (x y + y x) r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = r x y - y x r^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha =$

$\beta + (xy + yx)r^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in KSK$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy - yxr^*)^* = yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy - yxr^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - xr^*y - xry = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y$. Clearly, $(rx + xr^*), y, x, (yr^* + ry) \in K$ and $-x(r^* + r)y \in KSK$. Therefore, $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = \dots = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y \in KSK$ (notice that $K^2 \subseteq KSK$).

Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in K + KSK$. But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in K + KSK$. (Of course, from the first place we could take r^* instead of r , and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy + yx)r \in K + KSK$). Therefore, $(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + KSK$. Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in K + KSK$, $wu + u^*w \in K + KSK$. Clearly, it is enough to show that for every $u \in R$, $a \in K$ and $b \in KSK$: $au + u^*a \in K$ and $bu + u^*b \in KSK$ (since if $w = a + b$ with $a \in K$ and $b \in KSK$, $wu + u^*w = (a + b)u + u^*(a + b) = au + bu + u^*a + u^*b = (au + u^*a) + (bu + u^*b) \in K + KSK$). $(au + u^*a)^* = u^*a^* + a^*u = u^*(-a) + (-a)u = -(au + u^*a)$, so $au + u^*a \in K$. As for $b \in KSK$, it is enough to consider $b = xyz$ where $x, z \in K$ and $y \in S$. $bu + u^*b = (xyz)u + u^*(xyz) = xy(zu + u^*z) + (u^*x + xu)yz - xyu^*z - xuyz = xy(zu + u^*z) + (u^*x + xu)yz - x(yu^* + uy)z$. $(zu + u^*z), (u^*x + xu) \in K$ and $(yu^* + uy) \in S$, so $bu + u^*b = (xyz)u + u^*(xyz) = \dots = xy(zu + u^*z) + (u^*x + xu)yz - x(yu^* + uy)z \in KSK$. Next, for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in K + KSK$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy + yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy + yx)r)u + u^*((xy + yx)r) \in K + KSK$. Use again $(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + KSK$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy + yx)r)u = (xy + yx)ru \in K + KSK$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u^*((xy + yx)r) \in K + KSK$. So $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + KSK$. By assumption, $xy + yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy + yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R ($0 \neq xy + yx = 1(xy + yx)1 \in R(xy + yx)R$). R is simple, so $R(xy + yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + KSK$, hence $R = K + KSK$. $\square$

3.1.3. Results about $KS + K^2$.

Theorem 3.7. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Then,*

- (1) *If there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$, then $KS + K^2 = R$ (If there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq SK + K^2$, then $SK + K^2 = R$).*
- (2) *If there exist $x \in K$ and $y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$, then $KS + K^2 = R$ (If there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq SK + K^2$, then $SK + K^2 = R$).*
- (3) *If there exist $x \in K$ and $y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS$, then $KS = R$ (If there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq SK$, then $SK = R$).*

Proof. (1) Let $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$. For every $r \in R$, $rxy + xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* + yxr^* + xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* + (xy + yx)r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rxy + xyr^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rxy - yxr^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta + (xy + yx)r^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in KS + K^2$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy - yxr^*)^* = yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy - yxr^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* =$

$(rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - xr^*y - xry = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y$. Clearly, $(rx + xr^*), y, x, (yr^* + ry) \in K$. $-x(r^* + r)y \in K^2$ from our assumption that $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$. Therefore, $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = \dots = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y \in KS + K^2$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in KS + K^2$. But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in KS + K^2$. (Of course, from the first place we could take r^* instead of r , and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy + yx)r \in KS + K^2$). Therefore, $(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$.

Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in KS + K^2$, $wu - uw \in KS + K^2$. Clearly, it is enough to show that:

- For every $u \in R$, $a \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab \in KS$.
- For every $u \in R$, $a, b \in K$, $abu - uab \in K^2$.

(since if $KS + K^2 \ni w = w_1 + w_2$ with $w_1 \in KS$ and $w_2 \in K^2$, then $wu - uw = (w_1 + w_2)u - u(w_1 + w_2) = (w_1u - uw_1) + (w_2u - uw_2) \in KS + K^2$). Indeed;

- For every $u \in R$, $a \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b \in KS + KS = KS$ (obviously $(bu + u^*b) \in S$ and $(ua + au^*) \in K$).
- For every $u \in R$, $a, b \in K$, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b \in K^2$.

Next, for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in KS + K^2$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy + yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy + yx)r)u - u((xy + yx)r) \in KS + K^2$. Use again $(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy + yx)r)u = (xy + yx)ru \in KS + K^2$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $-u((xy + yx)r) \in KS + K^2$. So $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$. By assumption, $xy + yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy + yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R . R is simple, so $R(xy + yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$, hence $R = KS + K^2$. Similarly, one can show that $SK + K^2 = R$ (the changes that must be made are: $(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + K^2 \subseteq SK + K^2$ and for every $u \in R$ and $w \in SK + K^2$, $wu - uw \in SK + K^2$).

- (2) Let $x \in K$ and $y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$. For every $r \in R$, $rxy + xyr^* = rxy + yxr^* - yxr^* + xyr^* = rxy + yxr^* + (xy - yx)r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rxy + xyr^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rxy + yxr^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in KS + K^2$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy + yxr^*)^* = -yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy + yxr^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - xr^*y - xry = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y$. $(rx + xr^*), x \in K$, $y, (yr^* + ry) \in S$ and $-x(r^* + r)y \in KS + K^2$ (by assumption $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$). Therefore, $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = \dots = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y \in KS + K^2$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in K + KS + K^2 \subseteq KS + K^2$ (of course $K \subseteq KS$). But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS + K^2$. (Of course, from the first place we could take r^* instead of r , and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in KS + K^2$). Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$.

Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in KS + K^2$, $wu - uw \in KS + K^2$. Clearly, it is enough to show that for every $u \in R$, $a, c \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab \in KS$ and $acu - uac \in K^2$. Indeed; For every $u \in R$, $a, c \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b \in KS + KS = KS$ (obviously $(bu + u^*b) \in S$ and $(ua + au^*) \in K$) and $acu - uac = a(cu + u^*c) - (ua + au^*)c \in K^2$ (obviously $(cu + u^*c), (ua + au^*) \in K$). Next, for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS + K^2$,

so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u - u((xy - yx)r) \in KS + K^2$. Use again $(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in KS + K^2$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $-u((xy - yx)r) \in KS + K^2$. So $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$. By assumption, $xy - yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy - yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R . R is simple, so $R(xy - yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS + K^2$, hence $R = KS + K^2$. Similarly, one can show that $SK + K^2 = R$ (the changes that must be made are: $(xy - yx)R \subseteq SK + K^2$ and for every $u \in R$ and $w \in SK + K^2$, $wu - uw \in SK + K^2$).

- (3) Let $x \in K$ and $y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS$. For every $r \in R$, $rx y + xy r^* = rx y + yx r^* - yx r^* + xy r^* = rx y + yx r^* + (xy - yx)r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rx y + xy r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rx y + yx r^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in KS$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rx y + yx r^*)^* = -yx r^* - rx y = -(rx y + yx r^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rx y + xy r^* = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - xr^*y - xry = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y$. $(rx + xr^*)y, x(yr^* + ry) \in S$ and $-x(r^* + r)y \in KS$ (by assumption $xSy \subseteq KS$). Therefore, $\alpha = rx y + xy r^* = \dots = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y \in KS$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in K + KS \subseteq KS$ (of course $K \subseteq KS$). But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS$. (Of course, from the first place we could take r^* instead of r , and get, without using $R = R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in KS$). Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS$. Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in KS$, $wu - uw \in KS$. Clearly, it is enough to show that for every $u \in R$, $a \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab \in KS$. Indeed; For every $u \in R$, $a \in K$ and $b \in S$, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b \in KS + KS = KS$ (obviously $(bu + u^*b) \in S$ and $(ua + au^*) \in K$).

Next, for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u - u((xy - yx)r) \in KS$. Use again $(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in KS$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $-u((xy - yx)r) \in KS$. So $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq KS$. By assumption, $xy - yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy - yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R . R is simple, so $R(xy - yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS$, hence $R = KS$. Similarly, one can show that $SK = R$ (the changes that must be made are: $(xy - yx)R \subseteq SK$ and for every $u \in R$ and $w \in SK + K^2$, $wu - uw \in SK + K^2$).

□

Example 3.8. Matrices $M_n(F)$ ($\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$) satisfy the first condition and the second condition of the above theorem.

- (1) The first condition says: If there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$, then $KS + K^2 = R$. Matrices (with $n > 2$) satisfy a stronger condition, namely: there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq K^2$.
 – The transpose involution: $M_2(F) = KS + K^2$ (and $M_2(F) = SK + K^2$) can be easily seen as follows, without using Theorem 3.7 (The following computation seems better then using the first condition):

$$* KS \ni (e_{12} - e_{21})e_{11} = e_{12}e_{11} - e_{21}e_{11} = -e_{21}e_{11} = -e_{21}.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& * KS \ni (e_{12} - e_{21})e_{22} = e_{12}e_{22} - e_{21}e_{22} = e_{12}e_{22} = e_{12}. \\
& * KS \ni A = (e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{12} + e_{21}) = e_{12}e_{12} + e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} - e_{21}e_{21} = \\
& \quad e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} = e_{11} - e_{22}. \quad K^2 \ni B = (e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{12} - e_{21}) = \\
& \quad e_{12}e_{12} - e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} + e_{21}e_{21} = -e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} = -e_{11} - e_{22}. \\
& \quad KS + K^2 \ni A + B = (e_{11} - e_{22}) + (-e_{11} - e_{22}) = -2e_{22}. \quad KS + K^2 \ni \\
& \quad A - B = (e_{11} - e_{22}) - (-e_{11} - e_{22}) = 2e_{11}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, $e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{21}, e_{22} \in KS + K^2$, hence $M_2(F) = KS + K^2$.

For $n \geq 3$: Take $x = e_{12} - e_{21} \in K$, $y = e_{13} - e_{31} \in K$. $xy - yx = (e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{13} - e_{31}) + (e_{13} - e_{31})(e_{12} - e_{21}) = e_{12}e_{13} - e_{12}e_{31} - e_{21}e_{13} + e_{21}e_{31} + e_{13}e_{12} - e_{13}e_{21} - e_{31}e_{12} + e_{31}e_{21} = -e_{21}e_{13} - e_{31}e_{12} = -e_{23} - e_{32} \neq 0$. Let $(a_{ij}) = s \in S$. Then $xsy = (e_{12} - e_{21})s(e_{13} - e_{31}) = -s_{23}e_{11} + s_{13}e_{21} + s_{21}e_{13} - s_{11}e_{23}$. $e_{11}, e_{21}, e_{13}, e_{23} \in K^2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& * K^2 \ni A = (e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{12} - e_{21}) = e_{12}e_{12} - e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} + e_{21}e_{21} = \\
& \quad -e_{12}e_{21} - e_{21}e_{12} = -e_{11} - e_{22}. \quad K^2 \ni B = (e_{13} - e_{31})(e_{13} - e_{31}) = \\
& \quad -e_{11} - e_{33}. \quad K^2 \ni C = (e_{23} - e_{32})(e_{23} - e_{32}) = -e_{22} - e_{33}. \quad \text{Then, } K^2 \ni \\
& \quad -(1/2)[A + B - C] = -(1/2)[(-e_{11} - e_{22}) + (-e_{11} - e_{33}) - (-e_{22} - e_{33})] = \\
& \quad -(1/2)[-e_{11} - e_{22} - e_{11} - e_{33} + e_{22} + e_{33}] = -(1/2)[-2e_{11}] = e_{11}. \\
& * K^2 \ni -(e_{23} - e_{32})(e_{13} - e_{31}) = -[e_{23}e_{13} - e_{23}e_{31} - e_{32}e_{13} + e_{32}e_{31}] = \\
& \quad -[-e_{23}e_{31}] = e_{23}e_{31} = e_{21}. \\
& * K^2 \ni (e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{23} - e_{32}) = e_{12}e_{23} - e_{12}e_{32} - e_{21}e_{23} + e_{21}e_{32} = \\
& \quad e_{12}e_{23} = e_{13}. \\
& * K^2 \ni -[(e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{13} - e_{31})] = -[e_{12}e_{13} - e_{12}e_{31} - e_{21}e_{13} + e_{21}e_{31}] = \\
& \quad -[-e_{21}e_{13}] = e_{23}
\end{aligned}$$

– The symplectic involution: $M_2(F) = K + K^2$ (which is stronger than $M_2(F) = KS + K^2$) can be easily seen as follows, without using Theorem 3.7:

$$\begin{aligned}
& * K^2 \ni (e_{11} - e_{22})e_{12} = e_{11}e_{12} - e_{22}e_{12} = e_{11}e_{12} = e_{12}. \\
& * K^2 \ni (e_{11} - e_{22})e_{21} = e_{11}e_{21} - e_{22}e_{21} = -e_{22}e_{21} = -e_{21}. \\
& * K^2 \ni A = (e_{11} - e_{22})(e_{11} - e_{22}) = e_{11}e_{11} - e_{11}e_{22} - e_{22}e_{11} + e_{22}e_{22} = \\
& \quad e_{11}e_{11} + e_{22}e_{22} = e_{11} + e_{22}. \quad K \ni B = (e_{11} - e_{22}). \quad K^2 + K \ni \\
& \quad A + B = (e_{11} + e_{22}) + (e_{11} - e_{22}) = 2e_{11}. \quad K^2 + K \ni A - B = \\
& \quad (e_{11} + e_{22}) - (e_{11} - e_{22}) = 2e_{22}.
\end{aligned}$$

So, $e_{11}, e_{12}, e_{21}, e_{22} \in K + K^2$, hence $M_2(F) = K + K^2$. The first condition can also be used quite easily; Take $x = e_{12} \in K$, $y = e_{21} \in K$, then $xy + yx = e_{11} + e_{22} \neq 0$. For every $S \ni s = \alpha(e_{11} + e_{22})$ $xsy = \alpha xy \in K^2 \subseteq KS + K^2$.

For $n = 2m \geq 4$: Take $x = e_{1,m+1} \in K$, $y = e_{m+1,1} \in K$. $xy - yx = e_{1,m+1}e_{m+1,1} - e_{m+1,1}e_{1,m+1} = e_{11} - e_{m+1,m+1} \neq 0$. Let $(a_{ij}) = s \in S$. Then $xsy = e_{1,m+1}se_{m+1,1} = a_{m+1,m+1}e_{11}$. $e_{11} \in K^2$: $K^2 \ni e_{1,m+1}e_{m+1,1} = e_{11}$.

(2) The second condition says: If there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq SK + K^2$, then $SK + K^2 = R$. Matrices (with $n > 2$) satisfy a stronger condition, namely: there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq K^2$.

– The transpose involution: (Similar computations to the ones seen a few lines above show that $M_2(F) = SK + K^2$). For $n \geq 3$: Take $x = e_{12} + e_{21} \in S$, $y = e_{1n} - e_{n1} \in K$. $xy - yx = (e_{12} + e_{21})(e_{1n} - e_{n1}) - (e_{1n} -$

$e_{n1})(e_{12} + e_{21}) = e_{12}e_{1n} - e_{12}e_{n1} + e_{21}e_{1n} - e_{21}e_{n1} - e_{1n}e_{12} - e_{1n}e_{21} + e_{n1}e_{12} + e_{n1}e_{21} = e_{21}e_{1n} + e_{n1}e_{12} = e_{2n} + e_{n2} \neq 0$. Let $(a_{ij}) = s \in S$. Then $xsy = (e_{12} + e_{21})s(e_{1n} - e_{n1}) = -a_{2n}e_{11} - a_{1n}e_{21} + a_{21}e_{1n} + a_{11}e_{2n}$. $e_{11}, e_{21}, e_{1n}, e_{2n} \in K^2$:

* We have just seen that $e_{11}, e_{21} \in K^2$.

* $K^2 \ni (e_{1,n-1} - e_{n-1,1})(e_{n-1,n} - e_{n,n-1}) = e_{1,n-1}e_{n-1,n} - e_{1,n-1}e_{n,n-1} - e_{n-1,1}e_{n-1,n} + e_{n-1,1}e_{n,n-1} = e_{1,n-1}e_{n-1,n} = e_{1n}$.

* $K^2 \ni -[(e_{12} - e_{21})(e_{1n} - e_{n1})] = -[e_{12}e_{1n} - e_{12}e_{n1} - e_{21}e_{1n} + e_{21}e_{n1}] = -[-e_{21}e_{1n}] = e_{2n}$

– The symplectic involution: We have already seen a few lines above that a direct computation yields $M_2(F) = K + K^2$. However, the second condition cannot be used, since there are no $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ (indeed, $S \ni x = \beta(e_{11} + e_{22})$, so $xy - yx = \beta(e_{11} + e_{22})y - y\beta(e_{11} + e_{22}) = \beta(y - y) = 0$).

For $n = 2m \geq 4$: Take $x = e_{1,m} + e_{2m,m+1} \in S$, $y = e_{m,2m} \in K$. $xy - yx = (e_{1,m} + e_{2m,m+1})e_{m,2m} - e_{m,2m}(e_{1,m} + e_{2m,m+1}) = e_{1,m}e_{m,2m} + e_{2m,m+1}e_{m,2m} - e_{m,2m}e_{1,m} - e_{m,2m}e_{2m,m+1} = e_{1,m}e_{m,2m} - e_{m,2m}e_{2m,m+1} = e_{1,2m} - e_{m,m+1} \neq 0$. Let $(a_{ij}) = s \in S$. Then $xsy = (e_{1,m} + e_{2m,m+1})se_{m,2m} = a_{m,m}e_{1,2m} + a_{m+1,m}e_{2m,2m}$. $e_{1,2m}, e_{2m,2m} \in K^2$:

* $K^2 \ni (e_{1,m} + e_{2m,m+1})e_{m,2m} = e_{1,m}e_{m,2m} + e_{2m,m+1}e_{m,2m} = e_{1,2m}$.

* $K^2 \ni e_{2m,m}e_{m,2m} = e_{2m,2m}$.

3.1.4. *Results about $K + K^2, K + K^2 + K^3, K + K^3$.* For the next theorem about $K + K^2$ we assume that K is not a skew-commutative set. We have seen that in a simple ring R :

- If K is not skew-commutative, then $R = K + KSK$.
- If there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq K^2$ (in particular, K is not skew-commutative), then $KS + K^2 = R$ and $SK + K^2 = R$. (
- Without assuming that K is not a skew-commutative set: If there exist $x \in K, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq KS + K^2$, then $KS + K^2 = R$).

In order to show Herstein's stronger result, namely $R = K + K^2$, we demand a lot more than just non skew-commutativity of K ; We demand that there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx$ is right invertible and $xSy \subseteq K^2$. Notice that we demand much more than usual; Usually (take a look also in the next subsection), we demand that either $xy \pm yx \neq 0$ and $xAy \subseteq B$ (where $A \in \{S, K\}$ and $B \in \{S^2, K^2, KS + K^2, KS, K + KS + SK\}$) or $xy \pm yx$ is right invertible, but not both. We will not assume that R is simple (when $xy \pm yx$ is right invertible, simplicity of R is not needed). We demand that $xy + yx$ will be right invertible (instead of R is simple) since from $((xy + yx)r) = w \in K + K^2$ we are not able to show that one of the four expressions $\{wu + uw, wu - uw, wu + u^*w, wu - u^*w\}$ is also in $K + K^2$ (although for $w = ((xy + yx)r) \in K + K^2$ it is true that $wu - uw \in KS + K^2$, but this is not good enough for us). If we write $w = w_1 + w_2$ where $w_1 \in K, w_2 \in K^2$, then $w_1u + u^*w_1 \in K$ and $w_2u - uw_2 \in K^2$ (we have already seen that K^2 is a Lie ideal of R , see the proof of Theorem 3.7). However, we need the same expression for both w_1 and w_2 (in order to get that the two-sided ideal $R(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + K^2$).

Theorem 3.9. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra (not necessarily simple) with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume*

that K is not a skew-commutative set. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy + yx$ is right invertible and $xSy \subseteq K^2$ (or more generally, $xTy \subseteq K^2$), then $K + K^2 = R$.

Proof. K is not a skew-commutative set, hence there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy \neq -yx$. Hence $xy + yx \neq 0$. For every $r \in R$, $rx + xy + yx + yr^* = rxy + xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* + yxr^* + xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* + (xy + yx)r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rxy + xyr^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rxy - yxr^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta + (xy + yx)r^*$. Claim 1: $\alpha \in K^2$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy - yxr^*)^* = yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy - yxr^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - xr^*y - xry = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y$. Clearly, $(rx + xr^*), y, x, (yr^* + ry) \in K$. $-x(r^* + r)y \in K^2$ by our assumption that $xSy \subseteq K^2$. Therefore, $\alpha = rxy + xyr^* = \dots = (rx + xr^*)y + x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* + r)y \in K^2$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in K + K^2$. But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy + yx)r \in K + K^2$. Therefore, $(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + K^2$. Now, $xy + yx$ is right invertible, so there exists $z \in R$ such that $(xy + yx)z = 1$. For $r \in R$, $r = 1r = ((xy + yx)z)r = (xy + yx)(zr)$. We have just seen that $(xy + yx)R \subseteq K + K^2$, so $r = \dots = (xy + yx)(zr) \in K + K^2$. So each element $r \in R$ is in $K + K^2$, hence $K + K^2 = R$. $\square$

Example 3.10. Let $R = M_2(F)$, $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. The transpose involution is not an example, since for any $x, y \in K$, xSy is not contained in K^2 ($K^2 = \{\lambda(e_{11} + e_{22}) \mid \lambda \in F\}$). The symplectic involution is an example: Take $x = e_{12}$, $y = e_{21}$. Then $xy + yx = e_{12}e_{21} + e_{21}e_{12} = e_{11} + e_{22}$ which is, of course, invertible. $xSy \subseteq K^2$ (clearly, $S = \{\lambda(e_{11} + e_{22}) \mid \lambda \in F\}$): $e_{12}(ae_{11} + ae_{22})e_{21} = e_{12}(aI)e_{21} = a(e_{12}e_{21}) = ae_{11} = a(xy) \in K^2$.

We can also consider $K + K^2 + K^3$ and $K + K^3$. Now we assume that K is not a commutative set in order to get another theorem similar to that of Herstein's.

Theorem 3.11. Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that K is not a commutative set. Then,

- If there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, then $R = K + K^2 + K^3$.
- If R is simple and $K^2 \subseteq K + K^3$, then $K + K^3 = R$ (now we do not demand that there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, we just demand that K is a noncommutative set).

Notice that, as in Theorem 3.9, simplicity of R is not needed when $xy - yx$ is right invertible (and not just $xy - yx \neq 0$).

Proof. K is not a commutative set, hence there exist $x, y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. For every $r \in R$, $rx + xy - yx + yr^* = rxy - xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* + yxr^* - xyr^* = rxy - yxr^* - (xy - yx)r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rxy - xyr^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rxy - yxr^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta - (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim 1: $\alpha \in K^2 + K^3$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy - yxr^*)^* = yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy - yxr^*) = -\beta$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy - xyr^* = (rx + xr^*)y - x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* - r)y$. Clearly, $(rx + xr^*), y, -x, (yr^* + ry) \in K$ and $-x(r^* - r)y \in K^3$. Therefore, $\alpha = rxy - xyr^* =$

$\dots = (rx + xr^*)y - x(yr^* + ry) - x(r^* - r)y \in K^2 + K^3$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $-(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in K + K^2 + K^3$. But $R = R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in K + K^2 + K^3$. Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^2 + K^3$.

- If those $x, y \in K$ are such that $xy - yx$ is right invertible, then for every $r \in R$ $r = 1r = ((xy - yx)z)r = (xy - yx)(zr) \in K + K^2 + K^3$ (we assumed that z is the right inverse of $xy - yx$). Hence, $R = K + K^2 + K^3$.
- We have just seen that $(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^2 + K^3$. So, with our assumption that $K^2 \subseteq K + K^3$, we get that $(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^3$.

Claim 2: For every $u \in R$ and $w \in K + K^3$, $wu + u^*w \in K + K^3$. Clearly, it is enough to show that for every $u \in R$, $w_1 \in K$ and $w_2 \in K^3$: $w_1u + u^*w_1 \in K$ and $w_2u + u^*w_2 \in K^3$ (since if $w = w_1 + w_2$ with $w_1 \in K$ and $w_2 \in K^3$, $wu + u^*w = (w_1 + w_2)u + u^*(w_1 + w_2) = w_1u + w_2u + u^*w_1 + u^*w_2 = (w_1u + u^*w_1) + (w_2u + u^*w_2) \in K + K^3$). $(w_1u + u^*w_1)^* = u^*w_1^* + w_1^*u = u^*(-w_1) + (-w_1)u = -(w_1u + u^*w_1)$, so $w_1u + u^*w_1 \in K$. As for $w_2 \in K^3$, it is enough to consider $b = xyz$ where $x, y, z \in K$. $w_2u + u^*w_2 = (xyz)u + u^*(xyz) = xy(zu + u^*z) + (u^*x + xu)yz - x(yu^* + uy)z$. $(zu + u^*z), (u^*x + xu), (yu^* + uy) \in K$, so $w_2u + u^*w_2 = (xyz)u + u^*(xyz) = \dots = xy(zu + u^*z) + (u^*x + xu)yz - x(yu^* + uy)z \in K^3$. Next, for every $r \in R$, we have seen that $(xy - yx)r \in K + K^3$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u + u^*((xy - yx)r) \in K + K^3$. Use again $(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^3$ to get that (for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$) $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in K + K^3$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u^*((xy - yx)r) \in K + K^3$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^3$. By assumption, $xy - yx \neq 0$, so $R(xy - yx)R$ is a non-zero two-sided ideal of R ($0 \neq xy - yx = 1(xy - yx)1 \in R(xy - yx)R$). R is simple, so $R(xy - yx)R = R$. But we have just seen that $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq K + K^3$, hence $R = K + K^3$.

□

3.2. Results about SKS . We had two lemmas, Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. Remember that if we assume that S is not a commutative set, those two lemmas immediately imply Theorem 2.3 (and that theorem in turn implies its corollary, Corollary 2.4). Here we bring two similar lemmas to the ones just mentioned, and also if we assume that S is not a commutative set, then those two lemmas immediately imply a similar theorem to Theorem 2.3. Notice that SKS contains K, SK, KS (since $1 \in Z(R) \subseteq S$).

Lemma 3.12. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$. Then for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in SKS$. In other words, the right ideal $(xy - yx)R$ is contained in SKS .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r \in R$ $(xy - yx)r = 0 \in SKS$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$: For every $r \in R$, $rx y - x y r^* = rxy - yxr^* + yxr^* - xyr^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rxy - yxr^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rxy - yxr^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta - (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim: $\alpha \in SKS$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rxy - yxr^*)^* = yxr^* - rxy = -(rxy - yxr^*) = -(\beta)$. As for α : $\alpha = rxy - yxr^* =$

$(rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) + xr^*y - xry = (rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) - x(-r^* + r)y$.
 $(rx - xr^*), (yr^* - ry) \in K$, so $(rx - xr^*)y \in KS$ and $-x(yr^* - ry) \in SK$.
 $-x(-r^* + r)y \in SKS$. Hence, $\alpha = rxy - xyr^* = \dots = (rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) - x(-r^* + r)y \in SKS$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$,
 $-(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in SKS$. But $R = -R^*$, so for every $r \in R$,
 $(xy - yx)r \in SKS$. (Of course, from the first place we could take r^* instead
of r , and get, without using $R = -R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in SKS$). Therefore,
 $(xy - yx)R \subseteq SKS$.

□

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 3.12 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, therefore SKS contains a non-zero right ideal of R , namely $(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ (clearly, $0 \neq (xy - yx)1 \in (xy - yx)R$).

Lemma 3.13. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$. Then for every $r, u \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in SKS$. In other words, the two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in SKS .*

Proof. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r, u \in R$ $u(xy - yx)r = 0 \in SKS$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$:

Claim: for every $u \in R$ and $w \in SKS$, $wu + u^*w \in SKS$. It is enough to show that for every $a, c \in S$ and $b \in K$, $abcu + u^*abc \in SKS$ (indeed, if for every $a_i, c_i \in S$ and $b_i \in K$, $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in SKS$, then taking $SKS \ni w = \sum a_i b_i c_i$, we get $wu + u^*w = (\sum a_i b_i c_i)u + u^*(\sum a_i b_i c_i) = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i)$, so since each $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in SKS$, we get $wu + u^*w = \dots = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i) \in SKS$). Now, $abcu + u^*abc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - abu^*c - aubc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c$. Clearly, $cu + u^*c, u^*a + au \in S$ and $bu^* + ub \in K$, concluding that $abcu + u^*abc = \dots = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c \in SKS$. So we have proved the claim that for every $u \in R$ and $w \in SKS$, $wu + u^*w \in SKS$. Next, the above lemma, Lemma 3.12, says that for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in SKS$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u + u^*((xy - yx)r) \in SKS$. Use again the above lemma to get that $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in SKS$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u^*(xy - yx)r \in SKS$. Obviously, since $R = R^*$ we get that for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in SKS$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq SKS$.

□

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 3.13 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$, therefore SKS contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R , namely $R(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$.

We proceed to a theorem similar to Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 3.14. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then there exists a non-zero two-sided ideal of R which is contained in SKS .*

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 3.13, as was explained immediately after it. $\square$

Theorem 3.14 immediately implies the following:

Corollary 3.15. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Then $SKS = R$.*

Proof. Follows at once from Theorem 3.14. $\square$

In view of Corollary 2.11, one has:

Theorem 3.16. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then $SKS = R$.*

Proof. By assumption, $Z(R) \subsetneq S$, so from Corollary 2.11 we get that S is noncommutative. Now Corollary 3.15 implies that $SKS = R$. $\square$

Remember that the first criterion for $S^2 \subseteq S^3$ to equal R says the following: if there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $s \in S$ $xsy \in S^2$, then $S^2 = R$. We have seen that this condition is satisfied by matrices. Here we consider $KS + SK \subseteq SKS$. We show that if there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$ $xyk \in KS + SK$, then $R = KS + SK$. However, it is already not satisfied by matrices with the transpose involution. Therefore, it is probably less reasonable for a simple ring R to equal $KS + SK$ than to equal S^2 .

Lemma 3.17. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $k \in K$, $xyk \in KS + SK$. Then for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS + SK$. In other words, the right ideal $(xy - yx)R$ is contained in $KS + SK$.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $k \in K$, $xyk \in KS + SK$.

There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r \in R$ $(xy - yx)r = 0 \in KS + SK$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$: For every $r \in R$, $rx y - xy r^* = rx y - yx r^* + yx r^* - xy r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = rx y - xy r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = rx y - yx r^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta - (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim: $\alpha \in KS + SK$, $\beta \in K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K$, since $(\beta)^* = (rx y - yx r^*)^* = yx r^* - rx y = -(rx y - yx r^*) = -(\beta)$. As for α : $\alpha = rx y - xy r^* = (rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) + xr^*y - xry = (rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) - x(-r^* + r)y$. $(rx - xr^*)y \in KS$ and $-x(yr^* - ry) \in SK$. By assumption, $x, y \in S$ are such that for every $k \in K$, $xyk \in KS + SK$, hence $-x(-r^* + r)y = x(r^* - r)y \in KS + SK$. Hence, $\alpha = rx y - xy r^* = \dots = (rx - xr^*)y - x(yr^* - ry) - x(-r^* + r)y \in KS + SK$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $-(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in KS + SK$. But $R = -R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS + SK$. (Of course, from

the first place we could take r^* instead of r , and get, without using $R = -R^*$, that $(xy - yx)r \in KS + SK$. Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS + SK$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 3.17 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. However, in contrast to what we have seen above about SKS (noncommutativity of S implies that SKS contains a non-zero right ideal of R), noncommutativity of S does not imply that $KS + SK$ contains a non-zero right ideal of R . But, if those $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ also satisfy $xKy \subseteq KS + SK$ (this means that for every $k \in K$, $xky \in KS + SK$), then $KS + SK$ contains a non-zero right ideal of R (namely, $(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xKy \subseteq KS + SK$).

Lemma 3.18. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $k \in K$, $xky \in KS + SK$. Then for every $r, u \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in KS + SK$. In other words, the two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in $KS + SK$.*

Proof. Let $x, y \in S$ such that for every $k \in K$, $xky \in KS + SK$. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r, u \in R$ $u(xy - yx)r = 0 \in KS + SK$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$:

Claim: for every $u \in R$ and $w \in KS + SK$, $wu - uw \in KS + SK$. It is enough to show that for every $a \in S$ and $b \in K$, $abu - uab \in SK$ and for every $c \in K$ and $d \in S$, $cdu - ucd \in KS$. Indeed, if for every $a_i, d_i \in S$ and $b_i, c_i \in K$, $a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i \in SK$ and

$c_i d_i u - u c_i d_i \in KS$, then taking $KS + SK \ni w = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} a_i b_i + c_i d_i$ (we can take the same m

for both $\sum a_i b_i \in SK$ and $\sum c_i d_i \in KS$, just add zeros to the shorter sum), we get $wu - uw = (\sum a_i b_i + c_i d_i)u - u(\sum a_i b_i + c_i d_i) = \sum [(a_i b_i + c_i d_i)u - u(a_i b_i + c_i d_i)] = \sum [(a_i b_i)u + (c_i d_i)u - u(a_i b_i) - u(c_i d_i)] = \sum [(a_i b_i)u - u(a_i b_i) + (c_i d_i)u - u(c_i d_i)] = \sum [(a_i b_i)u - u(a_i b_i)] + \sum [(c_i d_i)u - u(c_i d_i)]$, so since $a_i b_i u - u a_i b_i \in SK$ and $c_i d_i u - u c_i d_i \in KS$, we get $wu - uw = \dots = \sum [(a_i b_i)u - u(a_i b_i)] + \sum [(c_i d_i)u - u(c_i d_i)] \in KS + SK$. Now, $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b$. Clearly, $(bu + u^*b) \in K$ and $-(ua + au^*) \in S$, concluding that $abu - uab = a(bu + u^*b) - (ua + au^*)b \in SK$. $cdu - ucd = c(du + u^*d) - (uc + cu^*)d$. Clearly, $(du + u^*d) \in S$ and $-(uc + cu^*) \in K$, concluding that $cdu - ucd = c(du + u^*d) - (uc + cu^*)d \in KS$. So we have proved the claim that for every $u \in R$ and $w \in KS + SK$, $wu - uw \in KS + SK$. Next, the above lemma, Lemma 3.17, says that for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in KS + SK$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u - u((xy - yx)r) \in KS + SK$. Use again the above lemma to get that $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in KS + SK$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u((xy - yx)r) \in KS + SK$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq KS + SK$. $\square$

If S is a noncommutative set (in Lemma 3.18 we have not demanded that S is a noncommutative set), then by definition exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$.

However, in contrast to what we have seen above about SKS (noncommutativity of S implies that SKS contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R), noncommutativity of S does not imply that $KS + SK$ contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R . But, if those $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ also satisfy $xKy \subseteq KS + SK$, then $KS + SK$ contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R (namely, $R(xy - yx)R$ where $x, y \in S$ with $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xKy \subseteq KS + SK$).

Next, similarly to Theorem 3.14 which dealt with SKS , we have the following theorem which deals with $KS + SK$.

Theorem 3.19. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in KS + SK$. Then there exists a non-zero two-sided ideal of R which is contained in $KS + SK$.*

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 3.18, as was explained immediately after it. $\square$

Corollary 3.20. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume S is not a commutative set. Also assume that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$, $xky \in KS + SK$. Then $KS + SK = R$.*

Proof. Follows at once from Theorem 3.19. $\square$

Remark 3.21. *As was already mentioned, the condition that there exist $x, y \in S$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and for every $k \in K$ $xky \in KS + SK$, is probably not satisfied by most such simple rings. That condition is necessarily not satisfied by $R = M_n(F)$ where $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$. Reason: If it was satisfied, then from Corollary 3.20 $KS + SK = M_n(F)$. However, $KS + SK \subsetneq M_n(F)$; Indeed, One can check that $SK \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$ (one can check that $KS \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$ or one can just conclude that $KS \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$ from $SK \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$ and the known fact that $\text{trace}(ab) = \text{trace}(ba)$ for any $a, b \in M_n(F)$, in particular one can take $a \in S, b \in K$). Therefore, $KS + SK \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$, so $KS + SK$ must be strictly contained in $M_n(F)$. As an exercise, one can take $n = 2$, and see that for any choice of $x, y \in S, k \in K$ it is impossible to have $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xky \in KS + SK \subseteq \{a \in M_n(F) \mid \text{trace}(a) = 0\}$.*

3.3. Results about S^2K, KS^2 . Here, in order to have a theorem for a simple ring, we are not willing to find $x, y \in S$ such that $xy \pm yx \neq 0$ (or $x, y \in K$ such that $xy \pm yx \neq 0$), instead we wish to find $s \in S, k \in K$ such that $sk - ks \neq 0$. So it seems that commutativity or noncommutativity of S will not concern us. However it will, as the following lemma shows:

Lemma 3.22. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Also assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then: S is a noncommutative set $\Leftrightarrow$ there exist $s \in S, k \in K$ such that $sk - ks \neq 0$.*

Proof. • Assume S is a noncommutative set. If for every $s \in S, k \in K$ $sk - ks = 0$, then $K \subseteq \text{Cent}(S)$. But the theorem of Herstein, Theorem 2.10, says that $\text{Cent}(S) \subseteq Z(R)$. Therefore, $K \subseteq Z(R)$. $*$ is of the first kind ($Z(R) \subseteq S$), so

$K \subseteq S$. Hence, from $S \cap K = 0$ (since $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$) we get $K = 0$, which implies that $R = S$, a contradiction to our usual assumption that $S \subsetneq R$. Therefore, there exist $s \in S, k \in K$ such that $sk - ks \neq 0$.

- Assume S is a commutative set. Then Corollary 2.11 shows that $S = Z(R)$, hence there is no chance to find $s \in S, k \in K$ such that $sk - ks \neq 0$. $\square$

The following lemmas and theorems are very similar to ones seen thus far. But notice that now, instead of taking $x, y \in S$ we will take $x \in S$ and $y \in K$.

Lemma 3.23. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x \in S$ and $y \in K$. Then for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. In other words, the right ideal $(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^2K .*

Proof. Let $x \in S$ and $y \in K$. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r \in R$ $(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^2K$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$: For every $r \in R$, $rx y + x y r^* = r x y + y x r^* - y x r^* + x y r^*$. Let $\alpha = \alpha(r) = r x y + x y r^*$, $\beta = \beta(r) = r x y + y x r^*$. We will just write α and β , instead of $\alpha(r)$ and $\beta(r)$. So for every $r \in R$, $\alpha = \beta + (xy - yx)r^*$.

Claim: $\alpha, \beta \in S^2K$. Indeed, obviously $\beta \in K \subseteq S^2K$, since $(\beta)^* = (r x y + y x r^*)^* = -y x r^* - r x y = -(r x y + y x r^*) = -(\beta)$. As for α : $\alpha = r x y + x y r^* = (r x + x r^*)y + x(y r^* + r y) - x r^* y - x r y = (r x + x r^*)y + x(y r^* + r y) - x(r^* + r)y$. $(r x + x r^*) \in S$, $(y r^* + r y) \in K$, so $(r x + x r^*)y \in SK \subseteq S^2K$ and $x(y r^* + r y) \in SK \subseteq S^2K$. $-x(r^* + r)y \in SSK = S^2K$. Hence, $\alpha = r x y + x y r^* = \dots = (r x + x r^*)y + x(y r^* + r y) - x(r^* + r)y \in S^2K$. Using the claim we get: for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r^* = -\beta + \alpha \in S^2$. But $R = -R^*$, so for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. Therefore, $(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^2K$. $\square$

If there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ (in Lemma 3.23 we have not demanded this), then S^2K contains a non-zero right ideal of R , namely $(xy - yx)R$ where $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ (clearly, $0 \neq (xy - yx)1 \in (xy - yx)R$).

Lemma 3.24. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Let $x \in S$ and $y \in K$. Then for every $r, u \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. In other words, the two-sided ideal $R(xy - yx)R$ is contained in S^2K .*

Proof. Let $x \in S$ and $y \in K$. There are two options:

- $xy - yx = 0$: Then, trivially, for every $r, u \in R$ $u(xy - yx)r = 0 \in S^2K$.
- $xy - yx \neq 0$:

Claim: for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^2K$, $wu + u^*w \in S^2K$. It is enough to show that for every $a, b \in S$ and $c \in K$, $abcu + u^*abc \in S^2K$ (indeed, if for every $a_i, b_i \in S$ and $c_i \in K$, $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in S^2K$, then taking $S^2K \ni w = \sum a_i b_i c_i$, we get $wu + u^*w = (\sum a_i b_i c_i)u + u^*(\sum a_i b_i c_i) = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i)$, so since each $a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i \in S^2K$, we get $wu + u^*w = \dots = \sum (a_i b_i c_i u + u^* a_i b_i c_i) \in S^2K$). Now, $abcu + u^*abc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - abu^*c - aubc = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c$. Clearly, $cu + u^*c \in K$,

$u^*a + au \in S$ and $bu^* + ub \in S$, concluding that $abcu + u^*abc = \dots = ab(cu + u^*c) + (u^*a + au)bc - a(bu^* + ub)c \in S^2K$. So we have proved the claim that for every $u \in R$ and $w \in S^2K$, $wu + u^*w \in S^2K$.

Next, the above lemma, Lemma 3.23, says that for every $r \in R$, $(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$, so from the claim just seen (with $w = (xy - yx)r$), for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $((xy - yx)r)u + u^*(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. Use again the above lemma to get that $((xy - yx)r)u = (xy - yx)ru \in S^2K$. Therefore, for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u^*(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. Obviously, since $R = R^*$ we get that for every $u \in R$ and for every $r \in R$, $u(xy - yx)r \in S^2K$. So $R(xy - yx)R \subseteq S^2K$. □

If there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ (in Lemma 3.24 we have not demanded this), then S^2K contains a non-zero two-sided ideal of R , namely $R(xy - yx)R$ where $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ (clearly, $0 \neq 1(xy - yx)1 \in R(xy - yx)R$).

We proceed to a theorem similar to Theorem 2.3.

Theorem 3.25. *Let R be an associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. Then there exists a non-zero two-sided ideal of R which is contained in S^2K .*

Proof. Follows immediately from Lemma 3.24, as was explained immediately after it. □

Theorem 3.25 immediately implies the following:

Corollary 3.26. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. Then $S^2K = R$.*

Proof. Follows at once from Theorem 3.25. □

One can use Corollary 2.11 and Lemma 3.22 in order to get the following theorem:

Theorem 3.27. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind such that $Z(R) \subsetneq S$ (and not just $Z(R) \subseteq S$) and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that $\dim_{Z(R)} R > 4$. Then $S^2K = R$.*

Proof. By assumption, $Z(R) \subsetneq S$, so from Corollary 2.11 we get that S is a noncommutative set. Then Lemma 3.22 says that there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$. Finally, Corollary 3.26 implies that $S^2K = R$. □

In view of Remark 3.21 which showed that with respect to the transpose involution, $KS + SK \subsetneq M_n(F)$ where $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, it seems not interesting to bring a detailed discussion for the following theorem. It is not difficult to complete all the details from Lemma 3.23 and from Lemma 3.24.

Theorem 3.28. *Let R be a simple associative unital F -algebra with $\text{Char}(F) \neq 2$. Let $*$ be an involution on R of the first kind and $S \subsetneq R$. Assume that there exist $x \in S$ and $y \in K$ such that $xy - yx \neq 0$ and $xSy \subseteq SK$ (or more generally, $xTy \subseteq SK$). Then $SK = R$.*

Finally, only a minor change in the discussion about S^2K (and SK) is needed in order to yield analog results for KS^2 (and KS); Just take now $x \in K$ and $y \in S$ (instead of $x \in S$ and $y \in K$).

REFERENCES

- [1] I.N. Herstein, *Topics in Ring Theory*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- [2] I.N. Herstein, *Rings with Involution*, Chicago Lectures in Mathematics, Chicago and London, The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- [3] L.H. Rowen, *Graduate Algebra: Noncommutative View*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Volume 91, American Mathematical Society, 2008.